
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2010

The Effects Of Power Distance, And Gender On The Use Of Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviors In Symmetrical And Asymmetrical Power Cond

Vincent Santilli
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Santilli, Vincent, "The Effects Of Power Distance, And Gender On The Use Of Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviors In Symmetrical And Asymmetrical Power Cond" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 4405.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4405>

THE EFFECTS OF POWER DISTANCE, AND GENDER ON THE USE OF
NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY BEHAVIORS IN SYMMETRICAL AND
ASYMMETRICAL POWER CONDITIONS: A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY

by
VINCENT SANTILLI
B.A. SUNY Oswego, 1990

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Masters of Arts
in the Nicholson School of Communication
in the College of Sciences at the University of Central
Florida.

Spring Term

2010

ABSTRACT

Previous cross-cultural research in nonverbal immediacy indicates that nonverbal immediacy behavior varies across cultures, and some researchers have suggested that power distance might serve as a moderating variable, however no research has systematically set out to determine whether that is the case. This study assessed the perceived use of nonverbal immediacy under symmetric and asymmetric power conditions, as well as gender, in three cultures: Brazil, Kenya, and the United States. Quantitative data was collected from 527 participants who completed a nonverbal immediacy measure and an individual power distance measure under either a symmetric or an asymmetric power condition. Results related to power distance partially supported the idea that cultural power distance may act as a moderating variable with regard to the use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Related to gender, results revealed that: (a) female participants perceived more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males, (b) under symmetric power conditions females were perceived to use more nonverbal immediacy than males, and (c) under asymmetric power conditions there was no statistically significant difference between use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors between females and males. Implications of results, limitations, and suggestions for future research are presented.

This work is dedicated to my sister, Angela.

November 3, 1971 – January 29, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF ACRONYMS	vii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Defining Immediacy	5
Verbal Immediacy.....	6
Nonverbal Immediacy.....	7
Cross-Cultural Research on Classroom Immediacy	8
Nonverbal Immediacy, Asymmetric Power, and Power Distance.....	12
Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviors and Asymmetric Relational Power	13
Power Distance	15
Nonverbal Immediacy and Power Distance.....	18
Gender.....	20
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	24
Sample.....	26
Instruments.....	30
Nonverbal Immediacy Scale (NIS).....	32
Individual Power Distance Measure	33
Background Homophily.....	33
Procedure	34
Data Analysis	34

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS	35
Manipulation Check.....	35
Hypothesis Testing.....	35
Summary of Results of Hypotheses	43
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	45
Limitations	50
Suggestions for Future Research	52
Conclusion	54
APPENDIX: A ENGLISH BEST-FRIEND VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE	55
APPENDIX: B ENGLISH PROFESSOR VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE.....	60
APPENDIX: C PORTUGUESE BEST-FRIEND VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE...	65
APPENDIX: D PORTUGUESE PROFESSOR VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE.....	71
APPENDIX: E IRB APPROVAL LETTER.....	77
REFERENCES	79

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. <i>Cross-Cultural Nonverbal Immediacy Studies</i>	9
Table 2. <i>Demographic Description of Samples</i>	29
Table 3. <i>Effect of Gender of Participant, Country, and Power Condition on Reported Nonverbal Immediacy</i>	37
Table 4. <i>Results of Simple Effects for Country Within Each Level of Power Condition</i> ..	38
Table 5. <i>Results of Simple Effect for Power Condition Within Each Level of Country</i>	39
Table 6. <i>Results of Simple Effects for Gender Within Each Level of Country Across Power Conditions</i>	40
Table 7. <i>Results of Simple Effects for Gender Within Each Level of Power Condition Across Countries</i>	40
Table 8. <i>Effect of Gender of Interactant, Country, and Power Condition on Reported Nonverbal Immediacy</i>	42
Table 9. <i>Results of Univariate Analyses for Gender of Interactant within Each Level of Power Condition</i>	43

LIST OF ACRONYMS

NIM	NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY MEASURE
NIS	NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY SCALE
RNIM	REVISED NONVERBAL IMMEDIACY MEASURE

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The idea of a set of interpersonal behavior patterns that can have the effect of drawing people "...toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and prefer" (Mehrabian, 1971, p.1), or immediacy behaviors, has been of interest to communication scholars since it was first presented by Mehrabian nearly 40 years ago. Based on a foundation of research conducted in the late 1960's, Mehrabian posited that immediacy behaviors reduce physical and psychological distances, and suggested that immediacy could be both nonverbally and verbally exhibited. Nonverbal immediacy, which involves the use of nonverbal behaviors such as eye contact, smiling, direct body orientation, closer proxemics, gesturing, vocal inflections, and physical contact while communicating, became the focus of a number of studies. Much of this research took place in the classroom setting, where researchers quickly associated it with positive outcomes such as learning (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Christophel, 1990; King & Witt, 2009; Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987), teacher credibility (Schrodt & Witt, 2006; Schrodt et al., 2009; Teven, 2007; Teven & Hanson, 2004; Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998), liking (Hinkle, 2001; Jones & Wirtz, 2007; Slane & Leak, 1978; Teven, 2007), and homophily (Powell, Hamilton, Hickson, & Stuckey, 2001; Rocca & McCroskey, 1999). In recent years immediacy has been increasingly studied in contexts beyond the classroom environment such as business/organizational settings (Faylor, Beebe, House, & Mottet, 2008; Kay & Christophel, 1995; Madlock, 2008; Richmond & McCroskey, 2000; Teven, 2007; Teven & Winters, 2007), medical settings (Richmond,

Smith, Heisel, & McCroskey, 2002; Zimmerman, 1993), and the sports settings (Turman, 2008).

From the beginning one variable that was noted as having an impact on immediacy was power, not only in the classroom, where the power differential between instructors and students is obvious, but in other contexts as well. Mehrabian (1971) had proposed that, “for two persons of different status the prerogative to assume a position more immediate to the other belongs to the one with higher status” (p.29). He also suggested that in asymmetric power conditions a differentiation in the nonverbal social interaction patterns between superiors and subordinates exists, and further proposed that differences in immediacy behaviors based on power differentials in relationships would be more pronounced in cultures with greater levels of hierarchy.

His observation dovetails with Hofstede’s (1980) conceptualization of power distance as a dimension of cultural variability that distinguishes between cultures. Hofstede described power distance as the degree to which the less powerful members within a culture expect and accept an unequal distribution of power between individuals of different status. Power distance has been suggested as an explanation of why stricter protocols of behavior may exist between subordinates and superiors in some cultures, but not in others. Indeed, several researchers have suggested that cultural power distance may have operated as a moderating variable in their cross-cultural studies of immediacy in the classroom (Johnson & Miller, 2002; Neuliep, 1997; Roach & Byrne, 2001). However, none of these researchers actually measured the construct in their samples. Research by Kowner and Wiseman (2003) on communication in asymmetrical dyads in the United States and Japan found that in addition to participants in both countries expecting

differences in behavior patterns between lower and higher status interlocutors, Japanese participants (high power distance culture) expected greater levels of behavior differences than did U.S. participants (low power distance culture) expected. The study did not, however, address immediacy explicitly. This author was unable to find any published study that has attempted to explore the possible moderating effects power distance has on immediacy behaviors across cultures. One possible explanation for this is that status "...is perhaps the most frequently overlooked of these variables for U.S. researchers, is because our culture fosters a view that it [status] is relatively unimportant" (Johnson & Tuttle, 1989, p.464). Understanding the relationship that power distance has on immediacy behaviors is an important step toward furthering the development of the immediacy construct. The first purpose of this study, therefore, was to cross-culturally evaluate nonverbal immediacy under symmetric and asymmetric power conditions in cultures with differing levels of cultural power distance.

A second variable that has been frequently explored with respect to immediacy behaviors is gender. Researchers have reported gender differences with respect to a range of nonverbal behaviors (Fernandez, Carrera, Sanchez, Paez, & Candia, 2000; Hall, 1978). Findings regarding gender and specific nonverbal immediacy behaviors such as smiling (Briton & Hall, 1995; Hall, Horgan, & Carter, 2002), and eye contact (Lutchmaya, Baron-Cohen, and Raggatt, 2002; Russo, 1975) indicate that females may use these behaviors more than males. In a sample of U.S. college students Richmond, McCroskey, and Johnson (2003) reported that females used more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males. Some scholars have suggested that gender differences in interpersonal communication may be due to power differences between males and females (Hall,

Coats, & LeBeau, 2005). Other research suggests that when females are in positions of power, their nonverbal behaviors may not differ from their male counterparts (Saechou, 2005). We might anticipate that such patterns would vary across cultures (Shuter, 1976; Sussman & Rosenfeld, 1982). Unfortunately little to no information is available regarding the relationship of gender and immediacy in cultural contexts other than in the United States. Although a number of cross-cultural studies of immediacy in the classroom have measured gender, none that this author was able to locate reported any analyses with gender as an independent variable. Therefore, the final purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between gender and perceived nonverbal immediacy behaviors across cultural groups, and to explore how that relationship was influenced by symmetric and asymmetric power conditions.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Immediacy

The fundamental presence of nonverbal communication in the communication process has long been recognized by communication scholars. Ting-Toomey (1999) called nonverbal symbols the “smallest unit of communication” (p.17) and “omnipresent throughout a culture—it is everywhere” (p.120). Mehrabian (1971) posited that nonverbal symbols will supersede verbal symbols in cases of verbal/nonverbal incongruence. His well-known 7%-38%-55% rule illustrates the principal that nonverbal communication bears a disproportionately high amount of influence, as compared to verbal communication “during the communication of emotions” (A. Mehrabian, personal e-mail communication August 4, 2008). That is to say that during the expression of emotions if the nonverbal message and the verbal message contradict each other, then the nonverbal message will carry more credence to the receiver.

Among the most widely studied constructs in nonverbal communication is nonverbal immediacy. The immediacy principle was first advanced by Albert Mehrabian to describe behavior patterns that can have the effect of drawing people “...toward persons and things they like, evaluate highly, and prefer” (Mehrabian, 1971, p.1). These behavior patterns increase the sensory stimulation between two persons (Mehrabian, 1971), and decrease physical and psychological distances (Andersen, 1979; Mottet & Richmond, 1998; Witt & Wheelless, 2001). Non-immediate behaviors, in contrast, communicate “avoidance, dislike, coldness, and interpersonal distance” (Kearney, Plax,

Smith, & Sorensen, 1988, p.55), and can cause people to, “avoid or move away from things they dislike, evaluate negatively, or do not prefer” (Mehrabian, 1971, p.1).

Verbal Immediacy

Mehrabian’s concept of immediacy encompasses two forms of communication: verbal and nonverbal. Verbal immediacy communicates the amount of interpersonal distance between persons through a speaker’s use of specific words in his/her verbal messages. Verbally immediate sentences are interpersonally inclusive, and incorporate words like: *us*, *we*, or *our*, which indicate interpersonal closeness. Non-immediate sentences however, integrate interpersonally non-inclusive words such as: *I*, *me*, *my*, *you*, *your*, or *that*, to indicate interpersonal distance, or separation and non-identity (Weiner & Mehrabian, 1968).

Verbal immediacy research is still recovering from criticisms related to the validity of Gorham’s (1988) Verbal Immediacy Behavior Scale (Hess & Smythe, 2001; Robinson & Richmond, 1995; Thomas, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1994). Gorham’s Verbal Immediacy Behavior Scale has been the workhorse measure of verbal immediacy. Robinson and Richmond stated in their abstract that “the scale is not recommended for continued use in communication research prior to its reformulation and additional testing for validity” (p.80). They went on to say that “It may well be the case that nonverbal factors are the essence of the immediacy construct and verbal factors are more related to other constructs” (p.84). Scholars agree that the item-generating process Gorham used to assemble the scale may have been flawed. As explained by Robinson and Richmond, in an effort to assemble a list of verbal immediacy items, Gorham asked participants to “think of the best teachers they had had throughout all their years of school and list the

specific behaviors which characterized those teachers” (Gorham, 1988, p.43). When analyzed literally, this item-generating process failed to specify the verbally immediate qualities described by Mehrabian. Instead Gorham may have created a measure of teacher competence—not verbal immediacy—because “Neither Mehrabian’s (1966, 1969) initial work on immediacy or Andersen’s (1979) immediacy study in the classroom setting gave rise to the premise that effective teaching and immediacy were interchangeable constructs” (Hess & Smythe, 2001, p.201). Mottet and Richmond’s (1998) dual study, further weakened verbal immediacy’s foundation as a construct by questioning the existence of verbal immediacy as a *linguistic phenomenon*. Despite these criticisms, Gorham’s scale continues to be used (e.g. Frymer & Houser, 2000; Turman, 2008) for lack of alternative measures. According to Witt, Wheelless, & Allen (2004), a verbal immediacy measure (Jordan, 1989; Jordan & Wheelless, 1990) was specifically created to more accurately assess verbal immediacy by incorporating items that more closely represented the concepts presented in Mehrabian’s original work, but it has yet to be published.

Nonverbal Immediacy

Nonverbal immediacy is interpersonal distance communicated through the use of specific nonverbal behaviors. A nonverbally immediate person is more likely to: smile, touch others, gesture, relax, be vocally expressive, communicate at closer physical distances, and use eye contact, direct body orientations, and over-all body movement while communicating (Andersen, 1979). To provide some examples of this we can consider the educational setting. An instructor engaging in nonverbal immediacy behaviors will be more likely to face his/her students while talking to them, instead of

facing the chalkboard; walk around the room and get physically closer to his/her students, as opposed to sitting at the front of the room and maintaining the desk in between him/herself and the students; touch students on the shoulder while talking to them, as opposed to not touching; gesture with his/her hands, as opposed to keeping his/her hands by his/her sides; make eye contact with students, as opposed to staring at the back of the room; use increased vocal inflection while speaking, as opposed to speaking in a monotone voice; and lean forward while talking, as opposed to remaining rigid.

Early operationalization of the immediacy construct was undertaken in Andersen's (1978) Behavior Indicators of Immediacy (BII), and the Generalized Immediacy scales (GI). In an effort to improve reliability scores on these instruments Richmond et al. (1987) created the 14-item Nonverbal Immediacy Measure (NIM), which was later amended to create the 10-item Revised Nonverbal Immediacy Measure (RNIM) (McCroskey, Richmond, Sallinen, Fayer, & Barraclough, 1995). More recently, Richmond et al. (2003) developed a 26-item Nonverbal Immediacy Scale (NIS) which has achieved a high alpha reliability score among U.S. participants. Studies conducted outside of the United States, however, have not always evidenced high reliability (Zhang & Oetzel, 2006).

Cross-Cultural Research on Classroom Immediacy

As a set of nonverbal behaviors with important implications for teaching competence and student learning, nonverbal immediacy has been the subject of a number of cross-cultural investigations. These investigations have compared aspects of nonverbal immediacy in the United States with immediacy in anywhere from one to four other cultures or nations. As Table 1 indicates, virtually all studies found nonverbal immediacy

scores among American participants to be higher than those of their colleagues in other nations. Saechou (2005) obtained a similar result when she compared perceived immediacy behaviors between U.S. teaching assistants to international teaching assistants, finding that American students reported that U.S. teaching assistants used more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than international teaching assistants. As Table 1 indicates, the variance within other cultures was not larger than that of the American samples.

Table 1. *Cross-Cultural Nonverbal Immediacy Studies*

Researchers and Countries	Results
Fayer, Gorham, & McCroskey (1993)	
United States, (Mainland)	M = “similar in both”
Puerto Rico, (United States)	M = “similar in both”
McCroskey, Richmond, Sallinen, Fayer, & Barraclough (1995)	
United States, (Mainland)	M = 28.2, SD = 7.8
Puerto Rico, (United States)	M = 28.8, SD = 8.8
Australia	M = 25.6, SD = 6.1
Finland	M = 23.9, SD = 7.9
Neuliep (1997)	
United States	M=27.7, SD =5.6
Japan	M=22.5, SD =4.6
Myers, Zhong, & Guan (1998)	
United States	M = 30.66, SD = 6.11

China	$M = 26.65, SD = 5.72$
Roach & Byrne (2001)	
United States	$M = 33.5, SD = n/a$
Germany	$M = 29.2, SD = n/a$
Johnson & Miller (2002)	
United States	$M = 38.21, SD = 8.90$
Kenya	$M = 33.50, SD = 7.45$
Pribyl, Sakamoto, & Keaten (2004)	
United States, (Mainland)	$M = 28.2, SD = 7.8$
Puerto Rico, (United States)	$M = 28.8, SD = 8.8$
Australia	$M = 25.6, SD = 6.1$
Finland	$M = 23.9, SD = 7.9$
Japan	$M = 21.8, SD = 7.9$
Roach, Cornett-DeVito, & DeVito (2005)	
United States	$M = 34.5, SD = 5.3$
France	$M = 24.5, SD = 6.0$
Zhang (2005a)	
United States	$M=3.35, SD= 0.45$
China	$M=3.35, SD = 0.32$
Zhang, Oetzel, Gao, Wilcox, & Takai (2007)	

United States	M = 3.81, SD = 0.61
Germany	M = 3.75, SD = 0.48
China	M = 3.60, SD = 0.54
Japan	M = 3.24, SD = 0.78

Note: “n/a” represents information that was not available.

Only Zhang’s (2005a) results were an exception to this pattern. The results of that study showed a mean perceived teacher nonverbal immediacy by U.S. students equal to Chinese students. However, class size discrepancies may account for this because Chinese participants were enrolled in smaller class sizes than U.S. participants. Gorham (1988) has suggested that class size may influence perceived instructor immediacy: “as class size increases, however, teachers become more differentiated in terms of their efforts to decrease psychological distance. A similar pattern emerges for nonverbal immediacy behaviors” (p.51).

Although the most obvious interpretation of these results would be that American instructors employ more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than instructors from most other cultures, it is important to mention that measurement issues could also be at play. A number of cross-cultural communication researchers have criticized the use of Western models of communication to explain the communication processes of non-Western cultures (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002; Yum, 1988; Zhang & Oetzel, 2006). Singelis and Brown (1995) stated, “...researchers must guard against imposing ethnocentric constructs and measurement tools across cultural groups” (p. 378). This could be true for immediacy measures, which have been designed for use in U.S. classrooms. Zhang (2005b) stated that up until the time of his writing, immediacy

instrument equivalence had been untested, and Zhang and Oetzel's (2006) literature review argued for the need for immediacy researchers to improve cross-cultural immediacy reliability scores. They proposed that designs of cross-cultural immediacy measures should be culturally sensitive to the countries being investigated. With that premise in mind they designed an immediacy measure culturally specific to China and therefore contextually sensitive to the unique relationship between Chinese students and Chinese teachers. Their Chinese Teacher Immediacy Scale achieved alpha reliability scores of .82, .84, and .85 for the three dimensions assessed. This was higher than Myers, Zhong, and Guan's (1998) alpha reliability of .70 for Chinese students when the U.S. based RNIM was used. In lieu of designing culture specific nonverbal immediacy measures for every culture, moderate success at increasing reliability scores has been achieved by modifying or eliminating problematic items within existing instruments (Johnson & Miller, 2002; McCroskey, Sallinen, Fayer, Richmond, & Barraclough, 1996; and Pribyl, Sakamoto, & Keaten, 2004).

Nonverbal Immediacy, Asymmetric Power, and Power Distance

Nevertheless, the differences in levels of instructor nonverbal immediacy reported by students from the United States as compared to those of other nations could be indicative of actual cultural differences in nonverbal behavior. The most frequently cited explanation for this difference is the possibility that cultural variables related to power may be moderating the use of nonverbal immediacy. In order to examine that possibility this author will first review Mehrabian's general statements regarding immediacy and power, and then describe the cultural orientation of power distance.

Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviors and Asymmetric Relational Power

From its inception, the construct of nonverbal immediacy has been understood to have a relationship with relational power. Mehrabian (1972) proposed that in asymmetric power conditions the use of immediacy behaviors would differ between superiors and subordinates, and that superiors would determine the degree of immediacy permitted in relationships. Several studies have since provided support for aspects of this assertion. Carney, Hall, and LeBeau (2005) assessed participants' expectations of the nonverbal behaviors that would be exhibited by individuals with high and those with low social power. Participants in that study associated 35 specific nonverbal behaviors more with high social power than low social power. Behaviors that participants believed were associated with high social power included nonverbal immediacy behaviors such as use of touch, eye contact, gestures, body orientation, leaning forward, and close proximity. Behaviors associated with low social power included: more self-touch, paying more attention to the other, facial fear, averting gaze, speaking with disfluencies, and pausing often during speech. A meta-analysis by Hall and colleagues (2005) of over 90 studies that assessed *actual* nonverbal behaviors used by high power participants reported similar findings. However, perceived *expectations* of these nonverbal behaviors by individuals in high power conditions were frequently higher than actual behaviors. Only three actual behaviors showed a statistically significant difference across studies comparing subordinate and superior behavior differences. In comparison to subordinates, superiors were found to use more facial expressiveness, more body openness, and smaller interpersonal distances. All of these are nonverbal immediacy behaviors. (It is important to note that one of the preconditions for eligibility in Hall and colleagues' meta-analysis

was that studies used had to be written in English. Consequently, 93% of the nonverbal behavior studies used in that meta-analysis were conducted in North America and Europe, with just 7% were from Asia and Central/South America.)

Thus in asymmetrical power situations the freedom to employ nonverbal immediacy behaviors appears to reside more with superiors than with subordinates. It may be the case that superiors adjust their levels of immediacy behaviors as a primary means of regulating the psychological distances between themselves and their subordinates. When they assess that closing that gap with a low-power interlocutor is desirable, they are likely to increase the number of immediacy cues they display; if they decide to maintain or expand psychological distances, immediacy behaviors will be minimized. As Mulder (1977) asserted:

The power distance theory says that the more powerful individual will try to increase the distance to the less powerful person. He will avoid association with the less powerful persons and his *feelings* towards them are negative. He cannot recognize himself (i.e. the picture he has made of himself) in less powerful persons and an increase in power of the less powerful person is a threat to his own, relatively more powerful, position (pp. 3-4; italics mine).

By this argument, immediacy behaviors may be a key means of modifying relational power differential (Matsumoto, 1991). As Georgakopoulos (2003) posited, immediacy behaviors "...come in conflict with behaviors aimed at the preservation or enlargement of power distance" (p.64). The idea that the increased use of nonverbal immediacy by superiors threatens to reduce power distance finds support in Golish and

Olson's (2000) finding that students were more likely to use expert power with a *nonverbally immediate* teacher than a *non-immediate* teacher.

Conversely, research on asymmetric dyads also suggests that subordinates may be more accurate at decoding nonverbal behaviors of superiors than superiors are at decoding behaviors of subordinates (Hall, Roslip, LeBeau, Horgan, & Carter, 2006). Scholars have offered two major explanations for this finding: (a) superiors send clearer cues for subordinates to interpret, as suggested by Snodgrass, Hecht, and Ploutz-Snyder (1998) or (b) subordinates, as a function of their lower status, are more motivated to decode (and more attentive to nonverbal cues displayed by their superiors, as posited by Fisk (1993). Hall and colleagues (2006) also found that participants in equal status dyads were more accurate at decoding nonverbal message cues than were either subordinates or superiors in asymmetric status dyads, indicating perhaps that power differential introduced ambiguity into nonverbal communication for both parties.

Power Distance

Based on this logic, when cultural differences with respect to relational power differential exist, we would likewise expect to find differences in the use of nonverbal immediacy in asymmetrical power relationships. Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimension of power distance lends support to this expectation by describing behavior patterns that reinforce or minimize power differences. Power distance is the first of five dimensions of cultural variability used by Hofstede (1980) to categorize and describe work related values and communication behaviors across cultures, based on his quantitative survey of the work related values of IBM employees around the world. According to Hofstede and Hofstede (2005):

Power distance can be defined as the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally. *Institutions* are the basic elements of society, such as the family, the school, and the community; *organizations* are the places where people work (p.46).

In low power distance societies there is a preference for interdependence between superior and subordinate, whereas dependence upon superiors is institutionalized in high power distance cultures. Power-holders in low power distance cultures may be *ashamed* of the power differences they have with the less powerful members of their society (Hofstede, 2001). In such situations powerful people may attempt to look *less* powerful than they really are, and “may enhance their informal status by renouncing formal symbols” (p.97). Thus Mehrabian (1971) stated regarding Americans, who are generally considered to be lower to medium in power distance, that they “as a general rule are uneasily reluctant to discuss their own status relative to others” (p.25). The phrase in the U.S. Declaration of Independence “all men are created equal” may be viewed as an explicit proclamation of American’s social value system as it relates to power distance.

The outworking of this view can be seen in the open communication patterns of low power distance cultures where superiors and subordinates often communicate as equals. In low power-distance cultures the teacher/student relationship is egalitarian and the education process is *student centered*. In this environment, student independence is encouraged, and as part of facilitating their intellectual independence students are expected to seek knowledge, ask questions, and exercise their critical thinking and debate skills, with instructors engaged in the process (Marcic & Pendergast, 1994). These

intellectual challenges by the student are rarely perceived as an affront to the teacher's competence or threatening to the teacher's self-confidence.

In contrast, in high power distance cultures "inequalities among people are expected and desired" (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005 p.59), and powerful people try to look as powerful as possible. Even though, in high power distance cultures, rigid protocols of behavior govern and preserve clearly defined boundaries between superiors and subordinates, and social inequality is a natural societal condition, there may still be "...a latent conflict between the powerful and the powerless, a basic mistrust that may never explode, but is always present" (Hofstede, 2001, p.97). To use the educational context as an example of this, the power dynamic between students and instructors varies from culture to culture. In high power-distance cultures, the educational process is *teacher centered* (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005), whereby the student assumes the subordinate role by adhering to a strict relationship of dependence upon the teacher. The teacher maintains strict order and decorum and the student speaks only when directed to by the teacher. Additionally, students are expected to receive knowledge, and never contradict nor debate their teachers. Kowner and Wiseman's (2003) comparative study of Japanese and American cultures supports this idea. In what they claimed to be the first cross-cultural examination of symmetric and asymmetric status differences across cultures, they found that Japanese participants (higher power distance) "felt more adverse to speaking with higher status people" (p. 205) than did Americans (lower power distance).

Hofstede's cultural dimensions have been criticized. One criticism is that culture is a fluid construct that changes over time. Because of the accelerating pace of globalization over the years, it is difficult to know how much of Hofstede's data

continues to accurately reflect current cultural attitudes. A study conducted by Fernandez, Carlson, Stepina, and Nicholson (1997) tested the stability of Hofstede's scores and found that *cultural shifting* may have occurred in several countries between the two periods of data collection. Triandis et al. (1986) found a similar cultural shift within Chile. In contrast, when Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) compiled several independently conducted major replication studies that assessed the stability of the IBM survey data they found "success of the replications" (p.28) in five out of the six studies with regards to the power distance index. An additional caveat to Hofstede's cultural dimensions is that they are not generalizable to the entire population. This is because the samples Hofstede used were managers, administrators, and other business professionals who represent an *elite* segment of the population in their respective nations.

This study proposed to compare perceptions of nonverbal immediacy behavior in four nations, two of which can be classified according to Hofstede's index as medium-high in power distance, and two of which can be classified as low or medium-low. Because of the possibility that the concern mentioned above regarding the validity of Hofstede's index, the following hypothesis is advanced:

H1: Individuals from high power distance cultures will score higher on individual power distance measures than will individuals from low power distance cultures.

Nonverbal Immediacy and Power Distance

Matsumoto (1991) has proposed that the cultural dimension of power distance, along with individualism, exerts the strongest influence on the amount of emotional expression across cultures of any cultural dimension. He suggests that because superiors in high power distance cultures are motivated to maintain or increase the power distance

between themselves and their subordinates, they will display behaviors that emphasize or preserve status. Nonverbal immediacy behaviors, therefore, should be low in asymmetrical power dyads in such cultural settings because superiors attempt to maximize psychological distances between themselves and lower power interactants. In contrast, superiors in low power distance cultures will often engage in behaviors that minimize differences in power or status differences: nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Matsumoto also asserts that in high power distance cultures the degree of difference in emotional display between high- and low-status interactants should be large. Within low power distance cultures the degree of difference between high- and low-status interactants should be smaller.

In contrast to Matsumoto (1991), Fernandez and colleagues (2000) reported from their 21 country cross-cultural study that the cultural dimension that best predicted high-emotional verbal and nonverbal expression was masculinity-femininity. On the other hand, van Hemert, Poortinga, and van de Vijver reported in their 2007 meta-analysis on emotional expression and culture that power distance and masculinity-femininity were *not* related to emotional expression, but individualism *was*.

Although they did not assess any of Hofstede's cultural dimensions, Kowner and Wiseman's (2003) examination of the differences between Japanese and U.S. university students regarding behaviors of high-status and low-status interlocutors provides some evidence of differences in nonverbal immediacy and deference behaviors across cultures. They hypothesized that respondents from both cultures would perceive similar patterns of status-related behaviors in symmetrical dyads, and a separate group of status-related behaviors in asymmetrical dyads. Additionally, they hypothesized that the magnitude of

the perceived differences between U.S. and Japanese respondents would be proportionally greater for Japanese respondents compared to the U.S. respondents. Their data supported both hypotheses. In addition, they found evidence that suggested there might be differences in how both cultures communicate nonverbally in asymmetric relationships. For example, with regard to nonverbal communication they found that “lower status people in Japan displayed almost all deference signs more frequently and strongly than did their American counterparts” (p.204), and additionally “lower status people in Japan were more conscious of their appearance, but less conscious of their behavior than their higher status compatriots” (p.205). Japanese participants reported being more averse to speaking with higher status people than American participants did.

Based on the above reasoning and the limited evidence available, the following hypotheses are advanced:

H2: In the asymmetric power condition, nonverbal immediacy behaviors will be reported more in low power distance than high power distance nations.

H3: The degree of the difference between levels of nonverbal immediacy in symmetric power conditions versus asymmetric power conditions will be greater for individuals from high power-distance nations than it will be for individuals from low power distance nations.

Gender

A large body of evidence suggests there are gender differences in the encoding and decoding of nonverbal behaviors. With regard to decoding differences, the results of Hall’s (1978) meta-analysis suggests that females are generally more accurate at decoding nonverbal communication than males, and this has been supported by a number

of other studies (Allen & Haccoun, Floyd & Mikkelson, Sogon & Izard, Stapley & Haviland cited in Gaines, 1998). Hall found the effect to be present across different age groups. Evidence also suggests females may recall more nonverbal behaviors than males, (Hall et al., 2006).

Although a large number of studies of immediacy in the classroom used mixed gender samples, little evidence has been reported regarding gender differences in the perception of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Richmond and colleagues (2003) reported that female participants rated targeted individuals as more nonverbally immediate than did males. With regard to differences in nonverbal encoding behaviors, evidence suggests women smile more than men (Briton & Hall, 1995; Hall et al., 2002), and engage in more eye contact (Lutchmaya et al., 2002; Russo, 1975). Both of these are considered to be nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Since those studies reported greater amounts of eye contact for females using two different age groups: infants (Lutchmaya et al., 2002), and grade school students (Russo, 1975), this could suggest that gender difference with regard to eye contact is consistent across age groups.

In light of that evidence, the following hypotheses were advanced:

H4: Across all samples, in both symmetrical and asymmetrical power conditions, females will perceive more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males.

H5: In symmetrical power conditions in all samples, females will be perceived as using more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males.

Though evidence suggests that the gender effect regarding the use of nonverbal communication may be consistent across age groups this effect may not be present in asymmetric power conditions. In her meta-analysis, Wilkins and Andersen (1991) found that women and men in positions of equal managerial power did not differ from each

other in their communicative behaviors. Similarly, Carney and colleagues (2005) assessed beliefs about the nonverbal expression of power and found evidence that gender did not moderate beliefs about the relationship between nonverbal behaviors and power. Furthermore, in Saechou's (2005) cross-cultural dissertation, data failed to support her hypothesis that female teaching assistants would use more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than male teaching assistants. The following hypothesis was therefore posited:

H6: In asymmetrical power conditions in all samples, there will be no statistically significant difference between the amount of nonverbal immediacy participants perceive as women using as compared to the amount of nonverbal immediacy they perceive men using.

Evidence also suggests that gender differences regarding the use of nonverbal behaviors may exist cross-culturally. In a cross-cultural study, involving 21 countries, conducted by Fernandez and colleagues (2000), females were found to be more emotionally expressive (both verbally and nonverbally) than men. With regard to specific nonverbal behavioral differences, Sussman and Rosenfeld (1982) found that female conversants from Venezuela, Japan and United States sat closer than the males of the respective cultures, suggesting the possibility that females may prefer closer proximity than males during conversations. Shuter (1976) observed members of Costa Rican, Colombian, and Panamanian general populations and found that female/female dyads touched significantly more frequently than male/male and male/female dyads. No cross-cultural immediacy studies have reported analyses with gender as an independent variable, and no evidence is available with respect to Brazil and Kenya, the specific cultures under study in this investigation. Thus a research question was posed:

RQ1: Will there be any effect for power distance on the relationship of gender with nonverbal immediacy?

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

This study employed self-administered questionnaires distributed to university students in three countries: United States, Brazil, and Kenya. Originally four cultures were chosen for the study: two medium-high power distance cultures (Brazil and Kenya), one low power distance culture (Israel), and one low-medium power distance culture (United States). At least two cultures at each end of the continuum are “necessary to test the effect of dimensions of cultural variability on communication. Without at least four cultures, the results may be due to unique aspects of the cultures studied rather than the dimensions of cultural variability studied” (Gudykunst, 1997, p.343).

Hofstede and Hofstede’s (2005) Power Distance Index ranks 76 nations and regions, with scores ranging from Austria on the extreme lower end with a score of 11 to Malaysia at the high end of the scale with a score of 104. The score for Brazil on Hofstede’s (2005) power distance index was 69. Hofstede does not include Kenya as its own entity on the power distance index, but instead groups Kenya together with three other East African countries: Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Zambia. Hofstede & Hofstede (2005) did not provide information about variation among the four countries they assessed in the East African region, but it seems safe to assume that those four countries were culturally similar given that their scores were aggregated. The power distance index score for the East African region was 64. Use of Brazil and Kenya as representative of higher power distance cultures relative to the United States and Israel was done partly because of researcher access to samples in these cultures. However, support for including Kenya as a relatively higher power distance culture may be found in descriptions in

previous research of Kenyan societal norms regarding status differences (Chabal & Daloz, and Maleche as cited by Johnson & Miller, 2002). Support for including Brazil as a representative of a higher power distance culture is found in O’Keefe and O’Keefe’s (2004) classification of Brazil as “relatively high power distance culture” (p. 616).

The United States (power distance index score = 40) and Israel (power distance index score = 13) were chosen to represent lower power distance countries in this study. Though the United States falls on the low-medium end of the power distance index, scholars have classified the United States as a “small power distance culture” (Ting-Toomey, 1999, p.70), or “relatively low” (O’Keefe & O’Keefe, 2004, p.615) power distance culture, or a “relatively small-power distance culture” (Oetzel et al., 2003, p.72). Because Israel’s score is the second lowest on the power distance index, it was the aim of this author originally to attain data from that culture. However, after repeated attempts, this author was unsuccessful at finding an Israeli university that would permit the conduct of this study on their campus. In the end samples were only drawn from three countries.

Because of this the study no longer involved the suggested minimum of four cultures in order to compare behavior from different ends of the cultural orientation continuum. It was therefore necessary to rephrase two of the hypotheses as follows:

H2: In the asymmetric power condition, nonverbal immediacy behaviors will be reported more in the United States than in Brazil and Kenya.

H3: The degree of the difference between levels of nonverbal immediacy in symmetric power conditions versus asymmetric power conditions will be greater for individuals from Brazil and Kenya than it will be for individuals from the United States.

Sample

Hofstede generated his original index (1980) by sampling from a population of business professionals employed at IBM offices around the world, but few researchers have had the same access to IBM employees that Hofstede once had. Evidence supports the correspondence of university student sample power distance scores with scores of Hofstede's IBM employee sample (Triandis et al., 1986). Furthermore, previous nonverbal immediacy studies have used university student samples (Fayer, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1993; Johnson & Miller, 2002; McCroskey et al., 1995; Neuliep, 1997; Pribyl et al., 2004; Roach & Byrne, 2001; Roach, Cornett-DeVito, & DeVito, 2005; Zhang, 2005a; Zhang, Oetzel, Gao, Wilcox, & Takai, 2007) and as have various cross-cultural studies that used Hofstede's power distance index as a variable (Bjorge, 2007; Merkin, 2006).

In this study, therefore, a sample of 527 university students was drawn: 136 students at Brazil's Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 186 students at Kenya's Daystar University, and 205 students at the University of Central Florida in the United States. Student participation was strictly voluntary and anonymous, and there was no extra credit, or any other incentive given to students for their participation. Data were collected in the middle of the semester in each country to ensure that students had enough time to be familiar with their instructors' nonverbal behaviors.

Permission to conduct this study at each university was achieved in a variety of ways because each university has different procedures for granting permission. Permission at the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro was granted by the Director of the Engineering Department. Because of this the researcher had access only to

engineering students, so 100% of the Brazilians who participated in this study were engineering students. One week prior to administering the questionnaires the director e-mailed all of the Engineering instructors to ask them to permit this researcher to enter their classrooms during the last 20 minutes of their classes to administer questionnaires. That e-mail included the caveat that the professors' and students' participation was strictly voluntary. To facilitate the administration of the questionnaires, the director of the Engineering Department asked members of a student social club (Interpoli) to assist this researcher. These volunteers helped this researcher to get permission from each professor to conduct the study in his/her class, and the volunteers provided participants with the basic instructions in their native language (Portuguese). The Portuguese consent forms were handed out first, and after the participants finished reading them the Portuguese questionnaires were handed out, and then collected when finished.

Permission to conduct the Kenyan portion of this study was obtained from the university Office of Research, Publication, and Consultancy, which presented this researcher with access to the full population of students. For this aspect of the study, a research assistant was hired to administer the consent forms and questionnaires, and then send the completed questionnaires back to the United States. The research assistant worked with administration officials to request permission from instructors to allow this study to be conducted during the first 20 minutes of their classes. The consent forms were handed out first, and after the participants finished reading them the questionnaires were handed out, and then collected when finished.

Permission to conduct the U.S. portion of the study was done through the University of Central Florida's Institutional Review Board. The entire U.S. portion of the

study was administered to one general education class in the communication department during the first 20 minutes of class. This single class approach was adequate because that particular class was a required class for all students at UCF, and therefore the composition of the students was heterogeneous in nature.

The demographics of the participants are described below in table 2.

Table 2. *Demographic Description of Samples*

Description	United States	Brazil	Kenya	Total
Gender				
M	65	72	58	259
F	123	54	109	245
Ages				
18-19	171	27	10	208
20-21	22	70	64	156
22-23	6	23	60	89
24-25	1	7	27	35
26-27	1	3	11	15
>27	1	0	4	5
Year				
Pre-University	0	1	0	1
First Year	142	32	10	184
Second Year	35	62	38	135
Third Year	17	22	60	99
Fourth Year	7	12	63	82
Fifth Year	1	1	3	5
Post-Graduate	0	0	1	1

Instruments

Previous researchers have used role playing (Hall et al., 2006), or hypothetical scenarios (Carney et al., 2005) to operationalize symmetrical and asymmetrical power conditions. This researcher chose to have participants refer to real life relationships to compare symmetrical and asymmetrical power conditions. The symmetric power condition was operationalized by a “best-friend” version of the questionnaire in which students were asked to write down the initial of their best-friend and fill out the remainder of the questionnaire with that person in mind. The best-friends dyad was specifically chosen to operationalize symmetrical power relationships with the assumption that best-friends in general are likely to have minimal differences in social status, economic status, and age. This researcher adopted the definition of friendship as a “non-kin peer relationships that are voluntary and are characterized by relatively high levels of emotional (but not physical) intimacy” (Gaines, 1998, p.507).

Previous research has used supervisor/subordinate relationships (Snodgrass et al., 1998); business owner/job applicant relationships (Hall et al., 2006), and instructor/student relationships (Spencer-Oatey, 1997) to assess interaction in asymmetric power conditions. In this study asymmetric dyads were operationalized via instructor/student relationships. To increase the pool of instructors who were being rated, students were asked to think of the instructor of the class they had immediately prior to the one they were in and fill out the questionnaire with that individual in mind. This technique has been used successfully in previous studies to access student responses to a wide variety of instructors (e.g. McCroskey, 1995; Richmond et al., 2003; Roach et al., 2005).

Questionnaires for the U.S. and Kenyan samples were written in English; for the Brazilian sample a Portuguese version was developed. According to J.C. McCroskey (personal communication, August 19, 2008), this study will be the first to use the NIS cross-culturally. Because every culture is unique, there is much to be aware of while customizing cross-cultural versions of the NIS. Zhang (2005a; 2006) discussed the importance of instrument equivalence in cross-cultural studies, and other communication scholars have directed attention to the methodological risks of employing what Ting-Toomey and Chung (1996) called “imposed etic” concepts to cross-cultural designs

Ideally, it would be preferable to design a “derived etic” by emically evaluating immediacy behaviors in both Brazil and the United States, and *then* etically assess universal immediacy behaviors. However, Triandis (1972) offers possible solutions to overcome these challenges. He posits that cross-cultural researchers must follow exactly the same procedures in all cultures being assessed, and the instruments used must pass reliability and validity tests.

Following Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey and Chua’s (1988) recommendations for translated instruments, the translated instruments used in this study needed to be “linguistically equivalent” to the English versions. Achieving this level of equivalence required more than conducting a simple translation. Hall (1966) suggested that a function of culture is to provide a sensory screening process so culturally relevant data are admitted and culturally irrelevant data are filtered. He further suggested that when exposed to the same stimuli, sensory filters of two different cultures will create two different perceptions. As an example of culturally directed perceptions, the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis proposes that language, “Far from being simply a technique of communication, it is itself a way of directing perceptions of its speakers and it

provides for them habitual modes of analyzing experience into significant categories” (Hojjer, 1992, p. 211).

A frequently used method of generating linguistically equivalent translations is the back translation method (Kowner & Wiseman, 2003; Merkin, 2006; Neuliep, 1997; Roach & Byrne, 2001; Spencer-Oatey, 1997; Zhang & Oetzel, 2006; Zhang 2005). A bilingual translator will translate the English version into the target language, and then a second bilingual translator back-translates that instrument back into English again. If the two English versions are identical, then the target language translation is considered equivalent. This was the procedure chosen to translate the questionnaires into Portuguese for the Brazilian portion of the study. A professional translator in Brazil translated the questionnaires into Portuguese, and then bilingual volunteers in the United States back translated the questionnaires back into English. The result of the back translation showed that the intent of each of the items on the questionnaires remained intact.

After translation, pretesting was conducted in the United States, Brazil and Kenya and, based on the feedback received during that process, minor modifications were made to the instructions in the questionnaire, and to the sequence of some of the questions prior to the final administration in any of the countries involved. See appendices for instruments.

Nonverbal Immediacy Scale (NIS)

In each country two customized versions of Richmond and colleagues’ (2003) Nonverbal Immediacy Scale (NIS), *other-report* were administered: (a) best-friend (symmetrical power condition), and (b) instructor (asymmetrical power condition). The NIS is a 26-item instrument balanced between 13 positively worded items and 13 negatively worded items. The NIS was selected because of its versatility because it

“could be used as a self-report instrument or (with modified wording) as an other-report instrument” (Richmond et al., 2003, p.504), and for its reliability scores at or above .90, with U.S. participants (Richmond et al., 2003). The wording in the instructor versions was slightly different than the best-friend versions. The best-friend versions started with the words “He/she...”, but the instructor versions were modified so that each item referenced the instructor of the previous class. According to McCroskey (personal communication, August 19, 2008), the present study was the first to use the NIS cross-culturally. Reliabilities for the present study were calculated separately for the sample from each country. Cronbach’s alpha for the U.S. sample was .90; for the Brazilian sample was .88; and for the Kenyan sample was .77.

Individual Power Distance Measure

For this study Oetzel and colleagues’ (2001) power distance measure was used. This is a nine-item, five-point Likert-type scale to which participants respond from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Previous alpha reliabilities have ranged from .64 (Oetzel, 2003) to .82 (Zhang, 2005b). For this study, the reliabilities were calculated separately for the sample from each country. Cronbach’s alpha for the U.S. sample was .66; the Brazilian sample was .58; and the Kenyan sample was .47. These reliabilities were deemed unacceptable, therefore the measure was not used in the final analyses.

Background Homophily

In order to assess whether the manipulation of power conditions was effective, students were presented with McCroskey and colleagues (1975) background homophily scale to which two items tapping societal status had been added. Cronbach’s alpha for the

modified background homophily scale was .88 for the U.S. sample, .91 for the Brazilian sample, and .85 for the Kenyan sample.

Procedure

Participants were first informed of the purpose of the study and assured of anonymity. They were then randomly assigned to either the symmetric or asymmetric power condition. Questionnaires were self-administered by students; filling out questionnaires took about 20 minutes. Once the questionnaires were completed and handed in, participants were given a chance to ask questions and then were debriefed.

Data Analysis

Data were entered into SPSS statistical software package. Questionnaires in which less than 70% of items were answered were excluded from data analysis. Based on that criterion three questionnaires from the U.S. sample, five from Brazil, and 29 from Kenya, or a total of 37 questionnaires were removed during this process. Accuracy of data entry was assured by reviewing all data points on 20% of the questionnaires and double checked by identifying wild codes. Reverse coding was then conducted on the nonverbal immediacy scale as per instructions of the scale authors (Richmond et al., 2003).

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Manipulation Check

In order to check whether the manipulation of the two power conditions had been successful, an independent samples *t*-test was run with power condition as the grouping variable and participant sense of homophily with the other interactant as the dependent variable. Results of the manipulation check indicated that in all three samples, participants rated best-friends as significantly higher in background homophily than they did instructors (United States: $t(198.78) = 12.02, p < .001$; Brazil: $t(119) = 8.97, p < .001$; Kenya: $t(134) = 6.78, p < .001$. In the U.S. sample Levine's test for equality of variance was significant, therefore the value reported does not assume equal variance.)

Hypothesis Testing

H1 predicted that individuals from high power distance cultures would score higher on individual power distance measures than would individuals from low power distance cultures. Because of the unacceptable reliability scores for the power distance measure in all three samples, this hypothesis could not be tested. Therefore the relative power distance of the three nations in Hofstede's power distance index could not be confirmed. Although this situation is not ideal, a number of previous studies have depended on Hofstede's index as a proxy for measurements of power distance (Bjorge, 2007; Georgakopoulos, 2003; Spencer-Oatey, 1997).

Even though the reliability score for the individual power distance measure was too low to use, a one-way ANOVA was run as a curio. Results of the omnibus test did

indicate an effect for country ($F(2,505) = 56.11, p < .000$). Pairwise comparison indicated significant differences between Kenya ($M=20.12, SD=4.34$) and both Brazil ($M=24.04, SD=4.33$), and the United States ($M=24.63, SD=4.38$), but no significant difference between Brazil and the United States.

H2, H3, and H4 were tested using a three-way ANOVA with nation (United States, Brazil, Kenya), power condition (symmetric, asymmetric), and gender of participant (male, female) as independent variables and reported nonverbal immediacy as the dependent variable. Prior to running the analysis outliers were identified by means of studentized residuals. Cases with residuals higher than 2.0 were removed from analysis. Ten cases were thus removed from the American sample, eight from the Brazilian sample, and seven from the Kenyan sample. Levene's test of equality of variance was not significant, therefore homogeneity of variance was assumed on the analysis. Results of the ANOVA are presented in Table 3. As indicated, a small-to-medium sized main effect was found for gender of participant (Cohen, 1965) and a medium-sized main effect was found for power condition. Small interaction effects were found for all possible two-way interactions. There was no three-way interaction.

Table 3. *Effect of Gender of Participant, Country, and Power Condition on Reported Nonverbal Immediacy*

Source	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Gender of Participant	1	26.32	.000	.053
Country	2	1.07	.345	.005
Power Condition	1	30.93	.000	.062
Gender of Participant * Country	2	6.74	.001	.028
Gender of Participant * Power Condition	1	6.85	.009	.014
Country * Power Condition	2	5.96	.003	.025
Gender of Participant * Country * Power Condition	2	1.49	.227	.006
Error	469			

H2 predicted that under asymmetric power conditions nonverbal immediacy behaviors would be reported more in the United States (low power distance) sample than in both Brazilian and Kenyan (high power distance) samples. As indicated in the table above, an interaction effect was found for country and power condition. In order to examine the effect of country on a single level of the power condition variable, simple effects were run on the interaction. Simple effects attempt to maintain the essential structure or nature of the interaction effect by breaking the interaction effect into component parts and testing each part for significance. As indicated in Table 4 the asymmetric power condition was not significant, therefore H2 was not supported. However, a small effect did emerge under the symmetric power condition.

Table 4. *Results of Simple Effects for Country Within Each Level of Power Condition*

Power Condition	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Symmetric	2	4.78	.009	.020
Asymmetric	2	2.39	.093	.010
Error	469			

H3 predicted that the degree of the difference between levels of nonverbal immediacy in symmetric power conditions versus asymmetric power conditions would be greater for individuals from Brazil and Kenya than it would be for individuals from the United States. In order to test this hypothesis simple effects on the interaction between power condition and country were run in the other direction, that is simple effects were run for the effect of power condition within the separate levels of the country variable. As indicated in Table 5, there was a medium effect size for the Brazilian sample but no significance in the Kenyan sample, and small effect size for the U.S. sample. Therefore H3 was partially supported.

Table 5. *Results of Simple Effect for Power Condition Within Each Level of Country*

Country	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
United States	1	5.34	.021	.011
Brazil	1	32.21	.000	.064
Kenya	1	1.92	.166	.004
Error	469			

H4 predicted that across all samples, in both symmetrical and asymmetrical power conditions, females would perceive more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males. As presented earlier in table 3, results indicated a main effect for gender of the participant with males ($M=18.4$, $SD=10.2$) perceiving less immediacy behavior than females ($M=23.9$, $SD=11.3$) across all countries and power conditions. The eta squared indicated a small to medium-sized effect. Thus H4 was supported.

Although the hypothesis regarding a main effect was supported, because two interaction effects also emerged involving gender of the participant, post hoc analyses in the form of simple effects were run on the interaction between gender and power condition as well as the interaction between gender and country. As indicated in Table 6, the interaction between gender and country revealed a medium-sized effect in the U.S. sample, small effect for the Kenyan sample and no significant effect for the Brazilian sample.

Table 6. *Results of Simple Effects for Gender Within Each Level of Country Across Power Conditions*

Country	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
United States	1	38.01	.000	.075
Brazil	1	.39	.532	.001
Kenya	1	6.28	.013	.013
Error	469			

In addition, as indicated in Table 7, the interaction between gender and power condition revealed a medium-sized effect in the symmetric power condition, but no significant effect for the asymmetric power condition sample.

Table 7. *Results of Simple Effects for Gender Within Each Level of Power Condition Across Countries*

Power Condition	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Symmetric	1	30.15	.000	.060
Asymmetric	1	3.14	.077	.007
Error	469			

H5 and H6 were tested using a three-way ANOVA with nation (United States, Brazil, Kenya), power condition (symmetric, asymmetric), and gender of interactant (male or female) as independent variables and nonverbal immediacy as the dependent variable. Prior to running the analysis outliers were identified by means of studentized residuals. Cases with residuals higher than 2.0 were removed from analysis. Four cases were thus removed from analysis of the American sample, seven from the Brazilian

sample, and ten from the Kenyan sample. Levene's test of equality of error variances indicated that equal variance could not be assumed. Therefore simple effects were not used to explore interaction effects. Instead the file was split and univariate analyses were run. Non-parametric tests were also run as a failsafe for parametric tests. Results are presented in Table 8 below. A small-to-medium-sized main effect emerged for power condition, and a small main effect for gender of interactant. Small two-way interaction effects were found for power condition and country, and power condition and gender of interactant.

Table 8. *Effect of Gender of Interactant, Country, and Power Condition on Reported Nonverbal Immediacy*

Source	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Gender of Interactant	1	7.89	.005	.016
Country	2	2.48	.085	.010
Power Condition	1	26.42	.000	.053
Gender of Interactant * Country	2	1.54	.215	.006
Gender of Interactant * Power Condition	1	8.85	.003	.018
Country * Power Condition	2	5.26	.006	.022
Gender of Interactant * Country * Power Condition	2	.39	.677	.002
Error	472			

H5 predicted that in the symmetrical power condition in all samples, females would be perceived as using more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males. In order to test this, an independent samples t-test was conducted within only the symmetric power condition. Results are presented in Table 9, and as indicated, men ($M=20.809$, $SD=9.735$) were reported as using less nonverbal immediacy behaviors than were women ($M=26.920$, $SD=10.241$). An independent samples Mann–Whitney U test further confirmed that the null hypothesis could be rejected. Therefore the hypothesis was supported.

Table 9. *Results of Univariate Analyses for Gender of Interactant within Each Level of Power Condition*

Power Condition	<i>t</i>	df	<i>p</i>
Symmetric	-4.68	241	.000
Asymmetric	-.32	224	.751

H6 predicted that in asymmetrical power conditions in all samples, there would be no statistically significant difference between the amount of nonverbal immediacy participants perceived women using as compared to the amount of nonverbal immediacy they perceived men using. Table 9 indicates the results for this interaction were not significant, and Mann-Whitney U test confirmed that the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Therefore this hypothesis was also supported.

RQ1 asked whether there would be any effect for power distance on the relationship of gender with nonverbal immediacy. Because the individual power distance measure's reliability was too low, this RQ was not directly testable. However, as noted in Table 3, an interaction effect was reported for gender of participant and country. This suggests there is an effect for power distance on the relationship of gender with nonverbal immediacy.

Summary of Results of Hypotheses

To conclude this chapter, results of the hypotheses and research questions are presented in summary form below.

H1: Individuals from high power distance cultures will score higher on individual power distance measures than will individuals from low power distance cultures. (*Not Testable*)

H2: In the asymmetric power condition, nonverbal immediacy behaviors will be reported more in the United States than in Brazil and Kenya. (*Not Supported*)

H3: The degree of the difference between levels of nonverbal immediacy in symmetric power conditions versus asymmetric power conditions will be greater for individuals from Brazil and Kenya than it will be for individuals from the United States. (*Partially Supported*)

H4: Across all samples, in both symmetrical and asymmetrical power conditions, females will perceive more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males. (*Supported*)

H5: In symmetrical power conditions in all samples, females will be perceived as using more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males. (*Supported*)

H6: In asymmetrical power conditions in all samples, there will be no statistically significant difference between the amount of nonverbal immediacy participants perceive as women using as compared to the amount of nonverbal immediacy they perceive men using. (*Supported*)

RQ1: Will there be any effect for power distance on the relationship of gender with nonverbal immediacy? (*Affirmative*)

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Because culture and communication are such inseparable elements of human behavior (Gudykunst, 1997; Hall, 1959; Hall, 1998), it is difficult to speak comprehensively about nonverbal immediacy behaviors without considering culture's influence. Recent cross-cultural immediacy studies have attempted to understand how the immediacy construct applies across cultures, and at times appear to have raised more questions than they have answered. One likely reason why results of cross-cultural immediacy research are less straightforward than immediacy studies conducted within the United States may lie with the fact that the immediacy construct was born and developed in the United States. It may well be a construct that is specific to U.S. culture, language, and systems. This is consistent with the general criticism that cross-cultural communication research in general errs in attempting to use Western models of communication to explain the communication processes of non-Western cultures (Oyserman, et al., 2002; Singelis & Brown, 1995; Yum, 1988; Zhang & Oetzel, 2006). Many methodological assumptions that have been safely made in the United States become problematic when applied to cultures outside the United States, perhaps explaining why in this study the data from the U.S. sample supported most of the hypotheses, whereas the Brazilian and Kenyan samples were not as consistent.

As expected, the results of this study demonstrate that perceptions of the use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors may not be consistent across all cultures and genders. With regard to power, even though variations on a country by country basis were found to be present throughout the analyses, one result in particular came as a surprise. The Brazilian and Kenyan samples, being medium-high power distance cultures, were expected to

demonstrate greater differences between the symmetric and asymmetric power conditions when compared to the U.S. sample. The results, however, were mixed. Although a medium-sized effect for power condition was found in the Brazilian sample, and a smaller effect for power condition emerged in the U.S. sample, no significant difference emerged between power conditions at all in the Kenyan sample.

This result may be due to two possibilities. First, Hofstede's power index scores may be out-dated due to cultural shifting, which might have occurred in the time since the power distance index was created. Given the rate of globalization, this cannot be discounted. The second possible explanation for these results is that perhaps power distance is not the variable this researcher should have been focusing on. Additional review of the literature in the light of these results reveals that an alternative cultural dimension described by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) fits the data more closely and can be theoretically tied to the research hypotheses. Much like Hofstede, Fons Trompenaars and Charles Hampden-Turner administered questionnaires to business professionals in 49 countries, but rather than five cultural dimensions these researchers derived seven. The dimensions are bipolar continuums that describe cultural values related to how people communicate with each other, as well as their attitudes toward time and the environment. The dimension that is pertinent to this study is the affectivity versus neutrality dimension. This dimension represents the degree to which individuals display their emotions. In an affective culture, people display their emotions openly; cultural boundaries do not restrict the expression of emotions. People in highly affective cultures tend to express their emotions liberally by "laughing, smiling, grimacing, scowling, and gesturing; they attempt to find immediate outlets for their feelings" (p.70). However, in a neutral culture, people

typically do not display their feelings outwardly, but instead control their emotions. That is to say that their cultural norms place greater value in keeping their feelings “controlled and subdued” (p.70). This dimension is pertinent to the results of this nonverbal immediacy study for two reasons: a) the relative ranking of Brazil, East Africa, and the United States on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s Affectivity/Neutrality bar graph (p.71), and b) the theoretical association between nonverbal immediacy behaviors and emotions.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner found that among 49 nations surveyed, Ethiopia rated highest with respect to neutrality. That is, 81% of persons studied responded that they would not show emotions openly. The United States fell lower on the scale than did Ethiopia, at 43%, and Brazil was slightly lower at 41%. Although Ethiopia and Kenya are distinct East African countries and may have different cultural values in this regard, it is possible that they are similar with respect to this cultural dimension. Hofstede’s own work does not distinguish between the scores of separate East African nations, but groups Kenya together with other East African countries like Ethiopia, Tanzania and Zambia. It is important to note that though the means in the symmetric power conditions of each culture are similar in rank to Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s affectivity/neutrality continuum, it is impossible for this researcher to determine if the results of this study correlate with the results of Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s affectivity/neutrality continuum without their data. Further, van Hemert and Poortinga examined how cultural expressiveness relates to three of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions. They did not find that emotional expression was related to uncertainty avoidance, but that it *was* positively related to individualism. A quick look at Hofstede and Hofstede’s (2005) individualism index shows that the United States is the highest on the index with a score of 91, and Brazil and Kenya occupy the lower end of

the index at 38 and 27 respectively, which does not coincide with the results from this study. Nevertheless, given how the data in this study with respect to the symmetrical power condition parallel the placement of those countries on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's affectivity/neutrality continuum, it is possible that cultural inclinations with respect to emotional expression could be useful for understanding the use of immediacy behaviors across cultural contexts.

Although this researcher was unable to find any studies that specifically attempted to investigate a relationship between nonverbal immediacy and the expression of emotions, positive relationships with nonverbal immediacy have been reported in studies using emotion-based variables such as affect (Andersen, 1978; Chesebro, 2003; Christensen & Menzel, 1998; McCroskey et al., 1995; Roach et al., 2005), interpersonal attraction (task, physical, and social) (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999), caring (Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998), and liking (Hinkle, 2001; Jones & Wirtz 2007; Slane and Leak 1978; Teven, 2007). To lend credence to the idea that liking can be considered an emotion-based variable, Slane and Leak discusses how the positive correlation they found between nonverbal immediacy and liking relates to emotional experience and emotional theory. Mehrabian (1971), himself implied some sort of relationship between the emotion and nonverbal immediacy when he stated; "Immediacy and liking are two sides of the same coin. That is, liking encourages greater immediacy and immediacy produces more liking" (p. 77). Future research on nonverbal immediacy may benefit from an exploration into how emotions and nonverbal immediacy relate to each other.

Finally, given that this study provides partial support for power distance's relationship to nonverbal immediacy, it may be premature to abandon the idea that there is a

link between the two. It may be the case that power distance's influence on the use of nonverbal immediacy may be secondary to cultural norms in emotional expression. The relationship of emotional expression to power distance may have already been identified by scholars who have proposed that Hofstede's power distance dimension influences the amount of emotional expression across cultures (Matsumoto, 1991; Porter & Samovar, 1998). In fact, Matsumoto (1991) has proposed that the cultural dimension of power distance, along with individualism, exerts the strongest influence on the amount of emotional expression across cultures of any cultural dimension. As Porter and Samovar (1998) summarized, "In high power distance cultures, status should have a considerable effect on emotional behavior" (p.463). The nature of this relationship may reside in Hofstede and Hofstede's (2005) explanation that in higher power distance cultures there are often larger emotional distances between subordinates and superiors than in low power distance cultures. Considering the mixed results of this study, it may be valuable to consider the possibility that emotional expression may be the primary moderator of nonverbal immediacy behaviors, and power distance might play a secondary role. Already evidence exists that suggests females are more emotionally expressive than males (Kring & Gordon, 1998), so if there is indeed a relationship between nonverbal immediacy and emotional expression, then gender should be included as a variable.

This brings us to the second half of the present study, which investigated the role of gender in nonverbal immediacy. The first gender related hypothesis predicted that females would perceive more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than males, across all nations and power conditions. This hypothesis was supported. However, a post hoc analysis revealed that in the Brazilian sample, under the asymmetric power condition, there was no significant

difference in the amount of nonverbal immediacy males and females perceived, even though the difference was significant in the United States and Kenyan samples. That is, the effect resided in the U.S. and Kenyan samples, but not the Brazilian one.

This study also predicted that in the symmetrical power condition in all samples, female interactants would be perceived as using more nonverbal immediacy behaviors than male interactants. In contrast, this study also predicted that there would be no significant difference between the genders in the asymmetric power condition. The fact that both of those hypotheses were supported strongly suggests that power and nonverbal immediacy may be somehow related. Since this study was conducted in the educational setting, it would be interesting if future research conducted a similar study under a different context, such as a business environment, to attempt to replicate these findings. If replicated, it would provide additional strength to the argument that power and nonverbal immediacy share a relationship.

This study was one of few nonverbal immediacy studies in which findings regarding gender as a variable were reported. Given the generally accepted truism that gender differences in communication are often signs of power differential, it would be beneficial for the maturation of the immediacy construct if researchers made it standard procedure to include gender as an independent variable, especially in cross-cultural studies.

Limitations

Several limitations of this study should be noted. First, there were a few small differences between how questionnaires were administered and completed in the different countries. In the United States and Kenya questionnaires were administered at the beginning of class whereas in Brazil they were administered at the end of class. In Brazil only

engineering students participated in this study, whereas in Kenya and the United States students from a broad spectrum of majors participated.

Additional limitations arose with respect to the Kenyan sample. First, a large portion of the Kenyan sample (18%) had to be culled from this study because of a failure to satisfy the 70 percent completion rule. It is difficult to definitively ascertain the reason(s) for this, but the fact that several (approximately 10-12) Kenyan participants wrote on their questionnaires that they thought there were too many questions, suggests the length of the questionnaire was a major factor. Second, even of the Kenyan questionnaires that passed the 70% rule, 18% of the Kenyan participants either did not answer the semantic differential questions in the homophily scale, or did not complete them correctly. In contrast only the one percent of the U.S. participants and three percent of the Brazilian participants had a similar problem. It is possible that this problem introduced some bias into the results with respect to the Kenyan sample.

This researcher believes the fact that there were only three countries instead of four was probably the most significant limitation of the study. Israel, having a very low score on Hofstede's power distance index, might have provided data that might have shed more light on the relationship between power distance and nonverbal immediacy.

A common limitation of this sort of study is the fact that self-administered questionnaires rely on participant memory of behaviors that may not typically be noticed consciously, and therefore may not be valid measures of actual nonverbal immediacy behavior (Andersen, 1979; Smythe & Hess, 2005). Future research should compare cultures with respect to observed immediacy behaviors rather than self-reported behaviors.

The final limitation of this study was the lack of reliability of the individual power distance scale. Even in the U.S. sample, internal consistency of the scale was low; in the Brazilian and Kenyan samples it was abysmal. Ultimately if power distance is to be considered in studies like this one, a reliable cross-cultural measure must be developed.

Suggestions for Future Research

A range of suggestions for future research have already been presented in the interpretation and limitation sections of this chapter. It may be useful to pull them together and summarize them here. The findings of this thesis have implications for future research in three major areas: research methodology, examination of gender in nonverbal immediacy studies, and exploration of the role of emotion in association with nonverbal immediacy and power distance across cultural contexts.

With regard to research methodology, this study is not the first to achieve unacceptable reliability scores with the individual power distance scale. Richardson and Smith (2007) had the same problem when they achieved alpha reliability scores ranging from .51 to .56. In fact, though the study from which this scale was borrowed (Oetzel et al., 2001) achieved higher reliability scores ranging from .68 to .80, there is clearly room for improvement. As mentioned previously, to effectively assess Hofstede's power distance moderating effects on nonverbal immediacy a more reliable individual power distance scale is needed. Another suggestion for future research, as it relates to methodology, would be to conduct a similar cross-cultural study in different contexts, such as the business setting, or even in the general populations. Assessing different immediacy under differing contexts will do much to further our understanding of nonverbal immediacy and how it relates to power differentials. Finally, future research should compare nonverbal immediacy behaviors across

cultures with respect to observed immediacy behaviors rather than strictly using self-reported behaviors.

The suggestion for future research related to gender and nonverbal immediacy is more general. Research conducted over the past 30 years has been supportive of the idea that there are gender differences in the use and perception of nonverbal behaviors. Given that this study supports the idea that there are gender differences with regard to use and perception of nonverbal *immediacy* behaviors as well, it would be helpful to the maturation of the immediacy construct if future researchers routinely included gender as a variable. This would not be too difficult because, for the most part, researchers are already collecting gender information within their demographic sections of their questionnaires. This comparison is especially important in cross-cultural studies.

The final category of suggestions for future research relate to emotions. As mentioned previously, how the country means (United States, Brazil and Kenya) in this study closely parallel the placement of those countries on Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's affectivity/neutrality bar graph, it might be valuable for future studies to examine the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and the expression of emotions. Particularly interesting would be to examine what variables might influence the expression of emotions and nonverbal immediacy. A useful starting point might be to look at sociological, economic and political factors within cultures and across cultures. In their meta-analysis involving 190 cross-cultural emotion studies, van Hemert and Poortinga (2007) found evidence that suggests cultural emotional expressivity is positively related to a) the percentage of service workers, b) level of democracy, c) observance of human rights, and d) political stability. When considering nonverbal immediacy's apparent relationship with

emotional expression, Van Hemert and Poortinga's (2007) meta-analysis brings up a wide variety of variables that can be examined by future nonverbal immediacy researchers.

Conclusion

The idea that culture is not inert has been argued by scholars and supported by data for decades. Cultural influences are present and active in most, if not all, communication processes we engage in. This cross-cultural nonverbal immediacy study took into account Hofstede's cultural dimension of power distance to learn more about how power influences nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Although the hypotheses related to power distance were partially supported, the most valuable outcome may be identifying that emotions, and therefore another cultural variable (affectivity/neutrality) might be related to the expression of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Finally, because this study provides additional evidence supporting the idea that gender differences may influence nonverbal perceptions and nonverbal behaviors, it highlights the need for future cross-cultural nonverbal immediacy studies to incorporate gender as a demographic independent variable.

APPENDIX: A
ENGLISH BEST-FRIEND VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire on Culture and Communication BF

I am a graduate student at the University of Central Florida pursuing my master's degree in interpersonal communication, and this questionnaire is part of my research toward completing my master's thesis. The purpose of this study is to compare the nonverbal communication patterns of people in several different countries. Your participation will help draw conclusions about several aspects of nonverbal communication behaviors, and how they are influenced by culture.

Your answers will be anonymous, so please do not put your name on this paper. In addition, your participation in completing the questionnaire is entirely voluntary. If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to contact me at: vroman777@yahoo.com.

Thank you for your time.

1. What is your major? _____
2. What is your age? (please circle one of the age categories below)
18-19 20-21 22-23 24-25 26-27 28 or above
3. Gender? (please circle one) Male or Female
4. What year are you in at your University? (please circle one below)
Pre-University First Year Second Year Third Year Fourth Year Fifth Year Post Graduation

Please read the following questions and ask yourself how much you personally agree or disagree with each statement being made. Using the scale below, please write a number next to each statement that best describes your opinion. Do not think about any specific conflict; just think about your attitudes in general. There are no right or wrong answers.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Indifferent/no Opinion 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

- ___ 5. In most situations, people in authority should make decisions without consulting their subordinates.
- ___ 6. Once a person in authority makes a decision, people under him/her should not question it.
- ___ 7. Low-status people should not express direct disagreement with high-status individuals.
- ___ 8. People in authority should be able to make the proper decisions without consulting others.
- ___ 9. People in authority who consistently consult others in decisions are indecisive.
- ___ 10. It is acceptable for people to occupy different status positions in an organization.
- ___ 11. In most situations, leaders should tell subordinates what to do rather than consult with them.
- ___ 12. In work-related matters, people in high status positions have a right to expect obedience from lower-status people.
- ___ 13. Employees who often question authority sometimes keep their managers from being effective.
- ___ 14. A listener should understand the intent of the speaker from the way the person talks.
- ___ 15. Fewer words can often lead to better understanding.
- ___ 16. It is better to risk saying too much than be misunderstood.
- ___ 17. It is more important to state a message efficiently than with great detail.
- ___ 18. Even if not stated exactly, a speaker's intent will rarely be misunderstood.
- ___ 19. The intended content of the message is more important than how a message is communicated.
- ___ 20. People should be able to understand the meaning of a statement by reading between the lines.
- ___ 21. Intentions not explicitly stated can often be inferred from the context.
- ___ 22. A speaker can assume that listeners will know what they really mean.
- ___ 23. People understand many things that are left unsaid.
- ___ 24. Listeners should be able to understand what a speaker is trying to express, even when the speaker does not say everything they intend to communicate.
- ___ 25. Speakers should not expect that listeners will figure out what they really mean unless the intended message is stated precisely.

The remainder of the questionnaire asks you to rate various qualities about your **best friend**. A best friend would be defined as a person with whom you share a close non-romantic friendship. If you have more than one best friend, please select one. The best friend you select for this survey can be male or female.

26. What is the first letter of your best friend's first name? ____
27. What is the gender of your best friend? (please circle one) Male or Female
28. What is the age of your best friend? (please circle one below)

17 or less 18-19 20-21 22-23 24-25 26-27 28 and above

The following statements describe ways your best friend might behave while talking to you. When responding please think of your best friend whose first initial you wrote above and indicate in the space at the left of each item how frequently he or she does each of the actions described. There are no right or wrong answers, just provide your honest opinion. Please use the following 5-point scale while thinking about your best friend:

1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Occasionally 4 = Often 5 = Very Often

- ____ 29. He/she uses his/her hands and arms to gesture while talking to you.
- ____ 30. He/she touches you on the shoulder or arm while talking to you.
- ____ 31. He/she uses a monotone or dull voice while talking to you.
- ____ 32. He/she looks over or away from you while talking to you.
- ____ 33. He/she moves away from you when you touch her/him while they are talking to you.
- ____ 34. He/she has a relaxed body position when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 35. He/she frowns while talking to you.
- ____ 36. He/she avoids eye contact while talking to you.
- ____ 37. He/she has a tense body position while talking to you.
- ____ 38. He/she sits close or stands close to you while talking to you.
- ____ 39. Her/his voice is monotonous or dull when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 40. He/she uses a variety of vocal expressions when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 41. He/she gestures when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 42. He/she is animated when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 43. He/she has a bland facial expression when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 44. He/she moves closer to you when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 45. He/she looks directly at you while talking to you.
- ____ 46. He/she is stiff when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 47. He/she has a lot of vocal variety when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 48. He/she avoids gesturing while he/she is talking to you.
- ____ 49. He/she leans toward you when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 50. He/she maintains eye contact with you when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 51. He/she tries not to sit or stand close to you when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 52. He/she leans away from you when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 53. He/she smiles when he/she talks to you.
- ____ 54. He/she avoids touching you when he/she talks to you.

We all know that our friends, like anyone else, have both strengths and weaknesses. For the following statements, please indicate how much each one relates to your best friend by writing the corresponding number next to each statement

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Indifferent/no Opinion 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

- _____ 55. This person is friendly.
- _____ 56. This person is likable.
- _____ 57. This person is approachable.
- _____ 58. I would ask this person for advice.
- _____ 59. This person is warm.
- _____ 60. I would like this person as a coworker.
- _____ 61. I would like this person as a roommate.
- _____ 62. I would like to be friends with this person.
- _____ 63. This person is physically attractive.
- _____ 64. This person is similar to me.
- _____ 65. This person is knowledgeable.

Still thinking of your best friend, on the scale below please circle the number that best represents your feelings about how similar your best friend is to you. Numbers "1" and "7" indicate a *very strong feeling*. Numbers "2" and "6" indicate a *strong feeling*. Numbers "3" and "5" indicate a *fairly weak feeling*. Number "4" indicates you are *undecided* or *don't know*. There are no right or wrong answers.

66	Is unlike me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is like me	66
67	Is different from me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is similar to me	67
68	Doesn't think like me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Thinks like me	68
69	Doesn't behave like me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Behaves like me	69
70	Has status different from mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Has status like mine	70
71	Is from a different social class	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is from the same social class	71
72	Is culturally different than me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is culturally similar to me	72
73	Doesn't have an economic situation like mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Has an economic situation like mine	73
74)	His/her position in society is not similar to mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	His/her position in society is similar to mine	74
75)	His/her position in American (USA) (Kenyan version "Kenyan") social hierarchy is different than mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	His/her position in American (USA) (Kenyan version "Kenyan") social hierarchy is similar to mine	75)

Finally, just like people everywhere even our best friends have different strengths and weaknesses. Below are lists of possible strengths and weaknesses people can have. Please indicate the impression you have of your best friend by circling the appropriate number between the pairs of adjectives below. The closer the number is to an adjective, the closer he/she is likely to be described as such. Numbers "1" and "7" indicate a *very strong feeling*. Numbers "2" and "6" indicate a *strong feeling*. Numbers "3" and "5" indicate a *fairly weak feeling*. Number "4" indicates you are *undecided* or *don't know*. Please circle the corresponding numbers below.

76.	Intelligent	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Unintelligent	76.
77.	Untrained	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Trained	77.
78.	Inexpert	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Expert	78.
79.	Informed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Uninformed	79.
80.	Incompetent	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Competent	80.
81.	Bright	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Stupid	81.

82.	Cares about me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Doesn't care about me	82.
83.	Has my interests at heart	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Doesn't have my interests at heart	83.
84.	Self-centered	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Not self-centered	84.
85.	Concerned with me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Unconcerned with me	85.
86.	Insensitive	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Sensitive	86.
87.	Not understanding	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Understanding	87.

88.	Honest	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Dishonest	88.
89.	Untrustworthy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Trustworthy	89.
90.	Honorable	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Dishonorable	90.
91.	Moral	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Immoral	91.
92.	Unethical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Ethical	92.
93.	Phony	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Genuine	93.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX: B
ENGLISH PROFESSOR VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire on Culture and Communication

P

I am a graduate student at the University of Central Florida pursuing my master's degree in interpersonal communication, and this questionnaire is part of my research toward completing my master's thesis. The purpose of this study is to compare the nonverbal communication patterns of people in several different countries. Your participation will help draw conclusions about several aspects of nonverbal communication behaviors, and how they are influenced by culture.

Your answers will be anonymous, so please do not put your name on this paper. In addition, your participation in completing the questionnaire is entirely voluntary. If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to contact me at: vroman777@yahoo.com.

Thank you for your time.

1. What is your major? _____
2. What is your age? (please circle one of the age categories below)
18-19 20-21 22-23 24-25 26-27 28 or above
3. Gender? (please circle one) Male or Female
4. What year are you in at your University? (please circle one below)
Pre-University First Year Second Year Third Year Fourth Year Fifth Year Post Graduation

Please read the following questions and ask yourself how much you personally agree or disagree with each statement being made. Using the scale below, please write a number next to each statement that best describes your opinion. Do not think about any specific conflict; just think about your attitudes in general. There are no right or wrong answers.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Indifferent/no Opinion 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

- _____ 5. In most situations, people in authority should make decisions without consulting their subordinates.
- _____ 6. Once a person in authority makes a decision, people under him/her should not question it.
- _____ 7. Low-status people should not express direct disagreement with high-status individuals.
- _____ 8. People in authority should be able to make the proper decisions without consulting others.
- _____ 9. People in authority who consistently consult others in decisions are indecisive.
- _____ 10. It is acceptable for people to occupy different status positions in an organization.
- _____ 11. In most situations, leaders should tell subordinates what to do rather than consult with them.
- _____ 12. In work-related matters, people in high status positions have a right to expect obedience from lower-status people.
- _____ 13. Employees who often question authority sometimes keep their managers from being effective.
- _____ 14. A listener should understand the intent of the speaker from the way the person talks.
- _____ 15. Fewer words can often lead to better understanding.
- _____ 16. It is better to risk saying too much than be misunderstood.
- _____ 17. It is more important to state a message efficiently than with great detail.
- _____ 18. Even if not stated exactly, a speaker's intent will rarely be misunderstood.
- _____ 19. The intended content of the message is more important than how a message is communicated.
- _____ 20. People should be able to understand the meaning of a statement by reading between the lines.
- _____ 21. Intentions not explicitly stated can often be inferred from the context.
- _____ 22. A speaker can assume that listeners will know what they really mean.
- _____ 23. People understand many things that are left unsaid.
- _____ 24. Listeners should be able to understand what a speaker is trying to express, even when the speaker does not say everything they intend to communicate.
- _____ 25. Speakers should not expect that listeners will figure out what they really mean unless the intended message is stated precisely.

The remainder of the questionnaire asks you to rate various qualities about the professor (Kenyan version “Instructor” hereafter) you had in the class before the one you are in right now. If the last professor you had was yesterday, then think of the last professor you had yesterday.

26. Did you have that professor last semester? (please circle one) Yes or No
 27. What is the gender of that professor? (please circle one) Male or Female
 28. Were there more than 10 students in that class? (please circle one) Yes or No

The following statements describe ways your professor might behave while talking to students. When responding please think of the professor you had in the class before the one you are in right now and indicate in the space at the left of each item how frequently he or she does each of the actions described. There are no right or wrong answers, just provide your honest opinion. Please use the following 5-point scale while thinking about your professor:

1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Occasionally 4 = Often 5 = Very Often

- ___ 29. The professor uses his/her hands and arms to gesture while talking to students.
- ___ 30. The professor touches students on the shoulder or arm while talking to students.
- ___ 31. The professor uses a monotone or dull voice while talking to students.
- ___ 32. The professor looks over or away from students while talking to them.
- ___ 33. The professor moves away from students when they touch her/him during conversation.
- ___ 34. The professor has a relaxed body position when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 35. The professor frowns while talking to students.
- ___ 36. The professor avoids eye contact while talking to students.
- ___ 37. The professor has a tense body position while talking to students.
- ___ 38. The professor sits close or stands close to students while talking to them.
- ___ 39. The professor voice is monotonous or dull when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 40. The professor uses a variety of vocal expressions when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 41. The professor gestures when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 42. The professor is animated when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 43. The professor has a bland facial expression when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 44. The professor moves closer to students when he/she talks to them.
- ___ 45. The professor looks directly at students while talking to them.
- ___ 46. The professor is stiff when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 47. The professor has a lot of vocal variety when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 48. The professor avoids gesturing while he/she is talking to students.
- ___ 49. The professor leans toward students when he/she talks to them.
- ___ 50. The professor maintains eye contact with students when he/she talks to them.
- ___ 51. The professor tries not to sit or stand close to students when he/she talks to them.
- ___ 52. The professor leans away from students when he/she talks to them.
- ___ 53. The professor smiles when he/she talks to students.
- ___ 54. The professor avoids touching students when he/she talks to them.

We all know that our professors, like anyone else, have both strengths and weaknesses. For the following statements, please continue to think about the professor you had in the class before this one and indicate how much each one relates to him/her by writing the corresponding number next to each statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Indifferent/No Opinion 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

- _____ 55. This person is friendly.
- _____ 56. This person is likable.
- _____ 57. This person is approachable.
- _____ 58. I would ask this person for advice.
- _____ 59. This person is warm.
- _____ 60. I would like this person as a coworker.
- _____ 61. I would like this person as a roommate.
- _____ 62. I would like to be friends with this person.
- _____ 63. This person is physically attractive.
- _____ 64. This person is similar to me.
- _____ 65. This person is knowledgeable.

Still thinking of the same professor, on the scale below please circle the number that best represents your feelings about how similar your professor is to you. Numbers “1” and “7” indicate a *very strong feeling*. Numbers “2” and “6” indicate a *strong feeling*. Numbers “3” and “5” indicate a *fairly weak feeling*. Number “4” indicates you are *undecided* or *don’t know*. There are no right or wrong answers.

66	Is unlike me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is like me	66
67	Is different from me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is similar to me	67
68	Doesn't think like me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Thinks like me	68
69	Doesn't behave like me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Behaves like me	69
70	Has status different from mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Has status like mine	70
71	Is from a different social class	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is from the same social class	71
72	Is culturally different than me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Is culturally similar to me	72
73	Doesn't have an economic situation like mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Has an economic situation like mine	73
74)	His/her position in society is not similar to mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	His/her position in society is similar to mine	74
75)	His/her position in American (USA) (Kenyan version “Kenyan”) social hierarchy is different than mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	His/her position in American (USA) (Kenyan version “Kenyan”) social hierarchy is similar to mine	75)

Finally, just like people everywhere even our professors have different strengths and weaknesses. Below are lists of possible strengths and weaknesses people can have. Please indicate the impression you have of the professor you've been responding about by circling the appropriate number between the pairs of adjectives below. The closer the number is to an adjective, the closer he/she is likely to be described as such. Numbers "1" and "7" indicate a *very strong feeling*. Numbers "2" and "6" indicate a *strong feeling*. Numbers "3" and "5" indicate a *fairly weak feeling*. Number "4" indicates you are *undecided or don't know*. Please circle the corresponding numbers below.

76.	Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unintelligent	76.
77.	Untrained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Trained	77.
78.	Inexpert	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Expert	78.
79.	Informed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninformed	79.
80.	Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent	80.
81.	Bright	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stupid	81.

82.	Cares about me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't care about me	82.
83.	Has my interests at heart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't have my interests at heart	83.
84.	Self-centered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not self-centered	84.
85.	Concerned with me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unconcerned with me	85.
86.	Insensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sensitive	86.
87.	Not understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Understanding	87.

88.	Honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dishonest	88.
89.	Untrustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Trustworthy	89.
90.	Honorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dishonorable	90.
91.	Moral	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Immoral	91.
92.	Unethical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Ethical	92.
93.	Phony	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Genuine	93.

Thank you for your time!

APPENDIX: C
PORTUGUESE BEST-FRIEND VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionário sobre Cultura e Comunicação

BF

Eu sou um estudante de pós-graduação da Universidade da Flórida Central buscando concluir meu mestrado em Comunicação Interpessoal e este questionário é parte da minha pesquisa para terminar minha tese de mestrado. A proposta desta pesquisa é comparar os padrões de comunicação não-verbal entre estudantes universitários de vários países. Sua participação ajudará a tirar conclusões sobre os diferentes aspectos das condutas da comunicação não-verbal e como elas são influenciadas pela cultura.

Suas respostas serão anônimas, por favor não escreva seu nome neste questionário. Sua participação neste questionário é totalmente voluntária. Caso você tenha alguma pergunta em relação à esta pesquisa fique à vontade para me contactar através do email: yroman777@yahoo.com

Obrigado pelo seu tempo.

1. Qual é o seu curso? _____

2. Qual é a sua idade? (por favor, Circule uma das opções abaixo):

18-19

20-21

22-23

24-25

26-27

28 ou mais

3. Sexo (por favor, circule): Masculino Feminino

4. Qual o ano que você está cursando? (Circule uma opção):

Primeiro Ano

Segundo Ano

Terceiro Ano

Quarto Ano

Quinto Ano

Pós-Graduação

Por favor, leia as questões abaixo e pergunte a si mesmo o quanto você concorda ou discorda com cada afirmativa. Usando a escala abaixo, escreva o número que melhor expresse sua opinião antes de cada afirmativa. Não pense em nenhuma situação específica, pense apenas sobre suas atitudes em geral. Não há resposta certa ou errada. Por favor, use a escala a seguir.

1 = Discordo Plenamente 2 = Discordo 3 = Indiferente/sem opinião 4 = Concordo 5 = Concordo Plenamente

____ 5. Na maioria das situações, as pessoas em cargos de autoridade deveriam tomar decisões sem consultarem seus subordinados.

____ 6. Uma vez que a pessoa em um cargo de autoridade tome uma decisão, seus subordinados não deveriam questionar.

____ 7. Pessoas que ocupam cargos inferiores não deveriam discordar com as pessoas de altos cargos.

____ 8. Pessoas em cargos de autoridade deveriam ser capazes de tomar decisões apropriadas sem consultar os outros.

____ 9. Pessoas que ocupam cargos de autoridade e constantemente consultam os outros para tomarem decisões são consideradas indecisas.

____ 10. É aceitável que as pessoas ocupem diferentes cargos em uma organização.

____ 11. Na maioria das situações, os líderes devem dizer aos seus subordinados o que fazer em vez de consultá-los.

____ 12. Em assuntos relacionados ao trabalho, pessoas que ocupam altos cargos têm o direito de exigir obediência de seus subordinados.

1 = Discordo Plenamente 2 = Discordo 3 = Indiferente/sem opinião 4 = Concordo 5 = Concordo Plenamente

____ 13. Os empregados que constatemente questionam a autoridade, podem impedir que seus gerentes sejam eficientes.

____ 14. O ouvinte deveria compreender a intenção do orador pela forma como ele se comunica.

____ 15. O uso de poucas palavras pode levar a uma melhor compreensão.

____ 16. É melhor arriscar e falar muito do que ser mal compreendido.

____ 17. É mais importante expressar a mensagem de forma eficiente do que com muitos detalhes.

____ 18. Mesmo que não seja transmitida de forma exata, a intenção do orador dificilmente será mal compreendida.

____ 19. O conteúdo da mensagem é mais importante do que a maneira como ela é comunicada.

____ 20. As pessoas deveriam ser capazes de compreender o significado de uma declaração lendo as entrelinhas.

____ 21. As intenções não declaradas de forma explícita geralmente podem ser deduzidas através do contexto.

____ 22. O falante pode supor que os ouvintes irão saber o que ele quer dizer.

____ 23. As pessoas compreendem muitas coisas que não foram ditas.

____ 24. Os ouvintes deveriam ser capazes de compreender o que o orador está tentando expressar mesmo quando o próprio orador não diz tudo que pretende.

____ 25. Os oradores não deveriam esperar que seus ouvintes compreendam o que eles realmente querem dizer, a menos que a mensagem seja transmitida com precisão.

No restante do questionário, peço a você que avalie várias qualidades do seu melhor amigo. O melhor amigo deve ser alguém com quem você não tenha uma relação romântica. Se você tiver mais de um melhor amigo, por favor selecione apenas um. O melhor amigo que você selecionar para essa pesquisa pode ser do sexo feminino ou masculino.

26. Qual o sexo de seu melhor amigo? (Circule uma opção) Masculino Feminino

27. Qual a primeira letra do nome do seu melhor amigo? _____

28. Qual a idade do seu melhor amigo? (Circule uma opção)

17 ou menos 18-19 20-21 22-23 24-25 26-27 28 ou mais

As afirmativas abaixo descrevem a maneira que seu melhor amigo talvez se comporte enquanto conversa com você. Ao responder, por favor pense em seu melhor amigo, o qual você escreveu a inicial do nome acima e indique no espaço à esquerda de cada item o grau com o qual você concorda com cada afirmativa. Não há uma resposta certa ou errada, apenas dê sua opinião honestamente. Por favor use a "escala de 5 pontos" a seguir, ao pensar sobre seu melhor amigo:

1 = Nunca 2 = Raramente 3 = Ocasionalmente 4 = Frequentemente 5 = Muito frequente

____ 29. Ele/ ela usa as mãos e braços para gesticular enquanto conversa com você.

____ 30. Ele/ ela toca o seu ombro ou braço enquanto conversa com você.

1 = Nunca 2 = Raramente 3 = Ocasionalmente 4 = Frequentemente 5 = Muito frequente

- ____ 31. Ele/ ela usa uma voz monótona ou tediosa enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 32. Ele/ ela mantém o olhar distante enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 33. Ele/ ela se esquia quando você o/ a toca enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 34. Ele/ ela tem uma expressão corporal relaxada enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 35. Ele/ ela franze as sombrancelhas enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 36. Ele/ ela evita olhar nos seus olhos enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 37. Ele/ ela tem uma expressão corporal tensa enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 38. Ele/ ela se senta perto ou fica próximo enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 39. A voz dele/ dela é monótona ou tediosa quando conversa com você.
- ____ 40. Ele/ ela usa uma variedade de expressões vocais quando conversa com você.
- ____ 41. Ele/ ela gesticula quando conversa com você.
- ____ 42. Ele/ ela é animado quando conversa com você.
- ____ 43. Ele/ ela tem uma expressão facial monótona quando conversa com você.
- ____ 44. Ele/ ela chega mais perto quando vocês conversam.
- ____ 45. Ele/ ela olha diretamente para você enquanto conversam.
- ____ 46. Ele/ ela fica rígido quando conversa com você.
- ____ 47. O tom da voz dele/ dela varia muito quando conversa com você.
- ____ 48. Ele/ ela evita gesticular enquanto conversa com você.
- ____ 49. Ele/ ela se inclina em sua direção quando conversa com você.
- ____ 50. Ele/ ela mantém os olhos em contato com os seus olhos quando conversa com você.
- ____ 51. Ele/ ela tenta não sentar perto ou se aproximar quando conversa com você.
- ____ 52. Ele/ ela se esquia quando conversa com você.
- ____ 53. Ele/ ela sorri quando conversa com você.
- ____ 54. Ele/ ela evita te tocar quando conversa com você.

Todós nós sabemos que nossos melhores amigos possuem pontos fortes e fracos como qualquer outra pessoa. Para as afirmativas a seguir, indique o quanto cada uma delas se relaciona com seu melhor amigo escrevendo o número correspondente antes de cada frase:

1 = Nunca 2 = Raramente 3 = Ocasionalmente 4 = Frequentemente 5 = Muito frequente

- ____ 55. Essa pessoa é amistosa.
- ____ 56. Essa pessoa é agradável.

- ____ 57. Essa pessoa é acessível.
- ____ 58. Eu pediria conselho a essa pessoa.
- ____ 59. Essa pessoa é afetuosa.
- ____ 60. Eu gostaria de ter essa pessoa como colega de trabalho.
- ____ 61. Eu gostaria de ter essa pessoa como colega de quarto.
- ____ 62. Eu gostaria de ser amigo dessa pessoa.
- ____ 63. Essa pessoa é atraente fisicamente.
- ____ 64. Essa pessoa se parece comigo.
- ____ 65. Essa pessoa é bem informada.

Continue a pensar no seu melhor amigo ao ler a escala abaixo. Circule o número que melhor represente sua opinião sobre o nível de semelhança entre vocês. Os números "1" e "7" descrevem uma *semelhança muito forte*. Os números "2" e "6" indicam uma *semelhança forte*. Os números "3" e "5" indicam uma *semelhança razoável*. Número "4" indica que você não sabe ou está indeciso. Não há respostas certas ou erradas:

É o contrário de mim	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É como eu	66.
É diferente de mim	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É semelhante a mim	67.
Não pensa como eu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Pensa como eu	68.
Não se comporta como eu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Se comporta como eu	69.
Possui um status diferente do meu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possui o mesmo status que eu	70.
É de uma classe social diferente	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É da mesma classe social	71.
É culturalmente diferente de mim	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É culturalmente semelhante à mim	72.
Não possui uma situação econômica como a minha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possui a mesma situação econômica que eu	73.
A posição social dele ou dela não é semelhante à minha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A posição social dele ou dela é semelhante à minha	74.
A posição dele/dela na hierarquia social brasileira é diferente da minha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A posição dele/dela na hierarquia social brasileira é semelhante à minha	75.

Finalmente, como as pessoas em qualquer lugar, nosso melhores amigos têm pontos fortes e fracos. Abaixo está uma lista de possíveis pontos fortes e fracos que as pessoas possam ter. Por favor indique a impressão que você tem de seu melhor amigo circulando o número mais apropriado entre os pares de adjetivos abaixo. O mais próximo que vocês estiver de uma adjetivo, mais seguro você está sobre sua avaliação. Por favor, circule os números correspondentes abaixo:

76.	Inteligente	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Pouco inteligente	76.
77.	Destreinado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Treinado	77.
78.	Desespecializado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Especializado	78.
79.	Informado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Desinformado	79.
80.	Incompetente	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competente	80.
81.	Brilhante	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Tolo	81.

82.	Se importa comigo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não se importa comigo	82
83.	Tem consideração pelos meus interesses pessoais	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não tem consideração pelos meus interesses pessoais	83
84.	Auto-Centrado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não é auto-centrado	84
85.	Se preocupa comigo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não se preocupa comigo	85
86.	Insensível	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sensível	86
87.	Não é compreensivo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Compreensivo	87

88.	Honesto	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Desonesto	88.
89.	Não é confiável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Confiável	89.
90.	Honrado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Desonrado	90.
91.	Moral	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Imoral	91.
92.	Nao possui Ética	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possui Ética	92.
93.	Falso	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sincero	93.

Obrigado pela sua ajuda.

APPENDIX: D
PORTUGUESE PROFESSOR VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionário sobre Cultura e Comunicação

P

Eu sou um estudante de pós-graduação da Universidade da Flórida Central buscando concluir meu mestrado em Comunicação Interpessoal e este questionário é parte da minha pesquisa para terminar minha tese de mestrado. A proposta desta pesquisa é comparar os padrões de comunicação não-verbal entre estudantes universitários de vários países. Sua participação ajudará a tirar conclusões sobre os diferentes aspectos das condutas da comunicação não-verbal e como elas são influenciadas pela cultura.

Suas respostas serão anônimas, por favor não escreva seu nome neste questionário. Sua participação neste questionário é totalmente voluntária. Caso você tenha alguma pergunta em relação à esta pesquisa fique à vontade para me contactar através do email: vroman777@yahoo.com

Obrigado pelo seu tempo.

1. Qual é o seu curso? _____
2. Qual é a sua idade? (por favor, Circule uma das opções abaixo):

18-19 20-21 22-23 24-25 26-27 28 ou mais

3. Sexo (por favor, circule): Masculino Feminino
4. Qual o ano que você está cursando? (Circule uma opção):

Primeiro Ano Segundo Ano Terceiro Ano Quarto Ano Quinto Ano Pós-Graduação

Por favor, leia as questões abaixo e pergunte a si mesmo o quanto você concorda ou discorda com cada afirmativa. Usando a escala abaixo, escreva o número que melhor expresse sua opinião antes de cada afirmativa. Não pense em nenhuma situação específica, pense apenas sobre suas atitudes em geral. Não há resposta certa ou errada.

1 = Discordo Plenamente 2 = Discordo 3 = Indiferente/ sem opinião 4 = Concordo 5 = Concordo Plenamente

____ 5. Na maioria das situações, as pessoas em cargos de autoridade deveriam tomar decisões sem consultar seus subordinados.

____ 6. Uma vez que a pessoa em um cargo de autoridade tome uma decisão, seus subordinados dele/ dela não deveriam questionar.

____ 7. Pessoas que ocupam cargos inferiores não deveriam discordar com as pessoas de altos cargos.

____ 8. Pessoas em cargos de autoridade deveriam ser capazes de tomar decisões apropriadas sem consultar os outros.

____ 9. Pessoas que ocupam cargos de autoridade e constantemente consultam os outros para tomarem decisões são consideradas indecisas.

____ 10. É aceitável que as pessoas ocupem diferentes cargos em uma organização.

____ 11. Na maioria das situações, os líderes devem dizer aos seus subordinados o que fazer em vez de consultá-los.

____ 12. Em assuntos relacionados ao trabalho, pessoas que ocupam altos cargos têm o direito de exigir obediência de seus subordinados.

____ 13. Os empregados que constatemente questionam a autoridade, podem impedir que seus gerentes sejam eficientes.

1 = Discordo Plenamente 2 = Discordo 3 = Indiferente/ sem opinião 4 = Concordo 5 = Concordo Plenamente

- ____ 14. O ouvinte deveria compreender a intenção do orador pela forma como ele se comunica.
- ____ 15. O uso de poucas palavras pode levar a uma melhor compreensão.
- ____ 16. É melhor arriscar e falar muito do que ser mal compreendido.
- ____ 17. É mais importante expressar a mensagem de forma eficiente do que com muitos detalhes.
- ____ 18. Mesmo que não seja transmitida de forma exata, a intenção do orador dificilmente será mal compreendida.
- ____ 19. O conteúdo da mensagem é mais importante do que a maneira como ela é comunicada.
- ____ 20. As pessoas deveriam ser capazes de compreender o significado de uma declaração lendo as entrelinhas.
- ____ 21. As intenções não declaradas de forma explícita geralmente podem ser deduzidas através do contexto.
- ____ 22. O falante pode supor que os ouvintes irão saber o que ele quer dizer.
- ____ 23. As pessoas compreendem muitas coisas que não foram ditas.
- ____ 24. Os ouvintes deveriam ser capazes de compreender o que o orador está tentando expressar mesmo quando o próprio orador não diz tudo que pretende.
- ____ 25. Os oradores não deveriam esperar que seus ouvintes compreendam o que eles realmente querem dizer, a menos que a mensagem seja transmitida com precisão.

.....

No restante do questionário peço a você que avalie várias qualidades do (a) professor(a) com quem você teve sua última aula, antes desta que você se encontra agora.

26. Você teve este professor no semestre passado? (Circule uma opção): Sim Não
27. Qual o sexo do seu (sua) professor (a)? (Circule uma opção): Masculino Feminino
28. Havia mais de 10 alunos em sua turma? (Circule uma opção): Sim Não

As afirmativas abaixo descrevem a maneira que seu **professor (a)** talvez se comporte enquanto conversa com seus alunos. Ao responder, por favor pense em seu (sua) professor (a) com quem você teve sua última aula. Indique no espaço à frente de cada frase a frequência que ele (a) age da forma descrita na setença. Não há uma resposta certa ou errada, apenas dê sua opinião honesta. Por favor use a "escala de 5 pontos" a seguir, ao pensar sobre seu (sua) professor(a):

1 = Nunca 2 = Raramente 3 = Ocasionalmente 4 = Frequentemente 5 = Muito frequente

- ____ 29. Ele/ ela usa as mãos e braços para gesticular enquanto conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 30. Ele/ ela toca o ombro ou braço dos estudantes enquanto conversa com eles.
- ____ 31. Ele/ ela usa uma voz monótona ou tediosa enquanto conversa com os estudantes.

1 = Nunca 2 = Raramente 3 = Ocasionalmente 4 = Frequentemente 5 = Muito frequente

- ____ 32. Ele/ ela mantém o olhar distante enquanto conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 33. Ele/ ela se esquia quando os estudantes o/a tocam durante uma conversa.
- ____ 34. Ele/ ela tem uma expressão corporal relaxada enquanto conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 35. Ele/ ela franze a testa enquanto conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 36. Ele/ ela evita olhar os estudantes nos olhos enquanto conversa com eles.
- ____ 37. Ele/ ela tem uma expressão corporal tensa enquanto conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 38. Ele/ela se senta perto, ou fica próximo dos estudantes enquanto conversa com eles.
- ____ 39. A voz dele/ dela é monótona ou tediosa quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 40. Ele/ ela usa uma variedade de expressões vocais quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 41. Ele/ ela gesticula quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 42. Ele/ ela é animado (a) quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 43. Ele/ ela tem uma expressão facial monótona quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 44. Ele/ ela se aproxima dos estudantes quando conversa com eles.
- ____ 45. Ele/ ela olha diretamente para os estudantes enquanto conversa com eles.
- ____ 46. Ele/ ela fica rígido quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 47. O tom da voz dele/ dela varia muito quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 48. Ele/ ela evita gesticular enquanto conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 49. Ele/ ela se inclina em direção aos estudantes enquanto conversa com eles.
- ____ 50. Ele/ ela mantém os olhos em contato com os estudantes enquanto conversa com eles.
- ____ 51. Ele/ ela tenta não sentar perto ou ficar próximo dos estudantes enquanto conversa com eles.
- ____ 52. Ele/ ela se esquia dos estudantes quando conversa com eles.
- ____ 53. Ele/ ela sorri quando conversa com os estudantes.
- ____ 54. Ele/ ela evita tocar os estudantes quando conversa com eles.

Todos nós sabemos que nossos professores possuem pontos fortes e fracos como qualquer outra pessoa. Continue a pensar sobre o professor com quem você teve a aula anterior a esta. Indique o quanto cada afirmativa se relaciona com ele, escrevendo o número correspondente antes de cada frase:

1 = Nunca 2 = Raramente 3 = Ocasionalmente 4 = Frequentemente 5 = Muito frequente

- ____ 55. Essa pessoa é amistosa.
- ____ 56. Essa pessoa é agradável.
- ____ 57. Essa pessoa é acessível.
- ____ 58. Eu pediria conselho a essa pessoa.
- ____ 59. Essa pessoa é afetuosa.
- ____ 60. Eu gostaria de ter essa pessoa como colega de trabalho.
- ____ 61. Eu gostaria de ter essa pessoa como colega de quarto.
- ____ 62. Eu gostaria de ser amiga dessa pessoa.
- ____ 63. Essa pessoa é atraente fisicamente.
- ____ 64. Essa pessoa se parece comigo.
- ____ 65. Essa pessoa é bem informada.

Continue a pensar no mesmo professor ao ler a escala abaixo. Circule o número que melhor represente sua opinião sobre o nível de semelhança entre vocês. Os números "1" e "7" descrevem uma *semelhança muito forte*. Os números "2" e "6" indicam uma *semelhança forte*. Os números "3" e "5" indicam uma *semelhança razoável*. Número "4" indica que você não sabe ou está indeciso. Não há respostas certas ou erradas:

É o contrário de mim	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É como eu	66.
É diferente de mim	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É semelhante a mim	67.
Não pensa como eu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Pensa como eu	68.
Não se comporta como eu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Se comporta como eu	69.
Possui um status diferente do meu	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possui o mesmo status que eu	70.
É de uma classe social diferente	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É da mesma classe social	71.
É culturalmente diferente de mim	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	É culturalmente semelhante à mim	72.
Não possui uma situação econômica como a minha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possui a mesma situação econômica que eu	73.
A posição social dele ou dela não é semelhante à minha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A posição social dele ou dela é semelhante à minha	74.
A posição dele/dela na hierarquia social brasileira é diferente da minha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	A posição dele/dela na hierarquia social brasileira é semelhante à minha	75.

Finalmente, como as pessoas em qualquer lugar, nosso (a) professor (a) tem pontos fortes e fracos. Abaixo está uma lista de possíveis pontos fortes e fracos que as pessoas possam ter. Por favor indique a impressão que você tem a respeito do seu professor (a), circulando o número mais apropriado entre os pares de adjetivos abaixo. Quanto mais próximo você estiver de um adjetivo, mais seguro você estará sobre sua avaliação. Circule os números correspondentes abaixo:

76.	Inteligente	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Pouco inteligente	76.
77.	Destreinado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Treinado	77.
78.	Desespecializado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Especializado	78.
79.	Informado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Desinformado	79.
80.	Incompetente	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competente	80.
81.	Brilhante	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Tolo	81.

82.	Se importa comigo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não se importa comigo	82.
83.	Tem consideração pelos meus interesses pessoais	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não tem consideração pelos meus interesses pessoais	83.
84.	Auto-Centrado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não é auto-centrado	84.
85.	Se preocupa comigo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Não se preocupa comigo	85.
86.	Insensível	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sensível	86.
87.	Não é compreensivo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Compreensivo	87.

88.	Honesto	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Desonesto	88.
89.	Não é confiável	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Confiável	89.
90.	Honrado	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Desonrado	90.
91.	Moral	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Imoral	91.
92.	Nao possui Ética	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possui Ética	92.
93.	Falso	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sincero	93.

Obrigado pela sua ajuda.

APPENDIX: E
IRB APPROVAL LETTER



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901, 407-882-2012 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Notice of Expedited Initial Review and Approval

From : UCF Institutional Review Board
FWA00000351, Exp. 10/8/11, IRB00001138

To : Vincent J. Santilli

Date : April 08, 2009

IRB Number: SBE-09-06167

Study Title: **The Effects of Power Distance, and High- and Low-Context Culture on the use of Nonverbal Immediacy Behaviors: A Cross-Cultural Study**

Dear Researcher:

Your research protocol noted above was approved by **expedited** review by the UCF IRB Chair on 4/8/2009. **The expiration date is 4/7/2010.** Your study was determined to be minimal risk for human subjects and expeditable per federal regulations, 45 CFR 46.110. The category for which this study qualifies as expeditable research is as follows:

7. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

The IRB has approved a **waiver of documentation of consent** for all subjects. Participants do not have to sign a consent form, but the IRB requires that you give participants a copy of the IRB-approved consent form, letter, information sheet. For online surveys, please advise participants to print out the consent document for their files.

All data, which may include signed consent form documents, must be retained in a locked file cabinet for a minimum of three years (six if HIPAA applies) past the completion of this research. Any links to the identification of participants should be maintained on a password-protected computer if electronic information is used. Additional requirements may be imposed by your funding agency, your department, or other entities. Access to data is limited to authorized individuals listed as key study personnel.

To continue this research beyond the expiration date, a Continuing Review Form must be submitted 2 – 4 weeks prior to the expiration date. Advise the IRB if you receive a subpoena for the release of this information, or if a breach of confidentiality occurs. Also report any unanticipated problems or serious adverse events (within 5 working days). Do not make changes to the protocol methodology or consent form before obtaining IRB approval. Changes can be submitted for IRB review using the Addendum/Modification Request Form. An Addendum/Modification Request Form **cannot** be used to extend the approval period of a study. All forms may be completed and submitted online at <http://iris.research.ucf.edu>.

Failure to provide a continuing review report could lead to study suspension, a loss of funding and/or publication possibilities, or reporting of noncompliance to sponsors or funding agencies. The IRB maintains the authority under 45 CFR 46.110(e) to observe or have a third party observe the consent process and the research.

On behalf of Tracy Dietz, Ph.D., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 04/08/2009 11:29:25 AM EDT

IRB Coordinator

REFERENCES

- Andersen, J.F. (1978). *The relationship between teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.
- Andersen, J.F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook*, 3 (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Bjorge, A.K. (2007). Power distance in English lingua franca e-mail communication. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17, 60-80.
- Briton, N.J., & Hall, J.A. (1995). Gender-based expectancies and observer judgments of smiling. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 19, 49-65.
- Carney, D. R., Hall, J., & LeBeau, L.S. (2005). Beliefs about the nonverbal expression of social power. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 29, 105-123.
- Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J.C. (2001). The relationship of teacher clarity and immediacy with student state receiver apprehension, affect, and cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 50, 59-68.
- Chesebro, J.C. (2003). Effects of teacher clarity and nonverbal immediacy on student learning, receiver apprehension, and affect. *Communication Education*, 52, 135-147.
- Christensen, L.J., & Menzel, K.E. (1998). The linear relationship between student reports of teacher immediacy behaviors and perceptions of state motivation, and cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. *Communication Education*, 47, 82-90.
- Cohen, J. (1965). Some statistical issues in psychology research. In B.B. Wolman (Ed.), *Handbook of Clinical Psychology* (pp. 95-121). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Christophel, D.M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 323-340.
- Fayer, J.M., Gorham, J., & McCroskey, J.C. (1993). Teacher immediacy and student learning: a comparison between U.S. mainland and Puerto Rican classrooms. In J. Fayer (Ed.), *Puerto Rican Communication Studies* (pp. 11-26). Puerto Rico: Fundacion Arqueologica, Antropologica, e Historica de Puerto Rico.
- Faylor, N.R., Beebe, S.A., Houser, M.L., & Mottet, T.P. (2008). Perceived differences in instructional communication behaviors between effective and ineffective

- corporate trainers. *Human Communication, A Publication of the Pacific and Asian Communication Association*, 11, 149-160.
- Fernandez, D.R., Carlson, D., Stepina, L.P., & Nicholson, N.D. (1997). Hofstede's country classification 25 years later. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 43-54.
- Fernandez, I., Carrera, P., Sanchez, F., Paez, D., & Candia, L. (2000). Differences between cultures in emotional verbal and non-verbal reactions. *Psicothema*, 12, 83-92.
- Fisk, S.T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. *American Psychologist*, 48, 621-628.
- Frymer, A.B., & Houser, M.L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education*, 49, 207-219.
- Gaines, S.O. (1998). Communication of emotions in friendships. In P.A. Andersen & L.K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 507-531). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Georgakopoulos, A. (2003). *A cross-cultural examination of immediacy and teacher effectiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.
- Golish, T.D., & Olson, N.O. (2000). Students' use of power in the classroom: An investigation of student power, teacher power, and teacher immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, 48, 293-310.
- Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education*, 37, 40-53.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1988). *Culture and Interpersonal Communication*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W.B. (1997). Cultural variability in communication an introduction. *Communication Research*, 24, 327-348.
- Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Hall, E.T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Hall, E.T. (1998). The power of hidden differences. In M.J. Milton (Ed.), *Basic concepts in intercultural communication, selected readings* (pp. 53-67). Yarmouth: Intercultural Press.

- Hall, J.A. (1978). Gender effects in decoding nonverbal cues. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, 845-857.
- Hall, J.A., Horgan, T.G., & Carter, J.D. (2002). Assigned and felt status in relation to observer coded and participant-reported smiling. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 26, 63-81.
- Hall, J.A., Coats, E.J., & LeBeau, L.S. (2005). Nonverbal behavior and the vertical dimension of social relations: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 898-924.
- Hall, J.A., Rosip, J.C., LeBeau, L.S., Horgan, T.G., & Carter J.D. (2006). Attributing sources of accuracy in unequal-power dyadic communication: Who is better and why? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 42, 18-27.
- Hess, J.A., & Smythe, M.J. (2001). Is teacher immediacy actually related to student cognitive learning? *Communication Studies*, 52, 197-219.
- Hinkle, L.L. (2001). Perceptions of supervisor nonverbal immediacy, vocalic, and subordinate liking. *Communication Research Reports*, 18, 128-136.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hoijer, H. (1982). The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. In L.A. Samovar & R.E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp 210-217). Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Johnson, D.J., & Tuttle, F. (1989). Problems in intercultural research. In M.K. Asante, & W.B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (pp. 461-483). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Johnson, S.D., & Miller, A.N. (2002). A cross-cultural study of immediacy, credibility, and learning in the U.S. and Kenya. *Communication Education*, 51, 280-292.
- Jones, S.M., & Wirtz, J.G. (2007). "Sad monkey see, monkey do:" Nonverbal matching in emotional support encounters. *Communication Studies*, 58, 71-86.

- Jordan, F.F. (1989). *An examination of the relationship between perceived verbal and paralinguistic immediacy and accommodation to perceived cognitive learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University.
- Jordan, F.F., & Wheelless, L.R. (1990, November). *An investigation of the relationships among teacher's verbal immediacy, paralinguistic immediacy, and speech accommodation in diverse classrooms*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kay, B., & Christophel, D.M. (1995). The relationships among manager communication openness, nonverbal immediacy, and subordinate motivation. *Communication Research Reports*, 12, 200-205.
- Kearney, P., Plax, T.G., Smith, V.R., & Sorensen, G. (1988). Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance to on-task demands. *Communication Education*, 37, 54-67.
- King, P., & Witt, P. (2009). Teacher immediacy, confidence testing, and the measurement of cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 58, 110-123.
- Kowner, R., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Culture and status-related behavior: Japanese and American perceptions of interaction in asymmetric dyads. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 37, 178-210.
- Kring, A.M., & Gordon, A.H. (1998). Sex differences in emotion: Expression, experience, and physiology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 686-703.
- Lutchmaya, S., Baron-Cohen, S., & Raggatt, P. (2002). Foetal testosterone and eye contact in 12-month-old human infants. *Infant Behavior & Development*, 25, 327-335.
- Madlock, P.E. (2008). Employee satisfaction: An examination of communicator competence. *Human Communication. A Publication of the Pacific and Asian Communication Association*, 11, 87-100.
- Marcic, D., & Pendergast, C. (1994). Perceptions of faculty and students towards case teaching in Czechoslovakia: A coming velvet paradigm shift? *Journal of Management Development*, 13, 12-22.
- Matsumoto, D. (1991). Cultural influences on facial expressions of emotion. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 56, 128-137.

- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Daly, J. A. (1975). The measurement of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research, 1*, 323-332.
- McCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J.M., & Barraclough, R.A. (1995). A cross-cultural and multi-behavioral analysis of the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education, 44*, 281-291.
- McCroskey, J.C., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J.M., Richmond, V.P., & Barraclough, R.A. (1996). Nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning: A cross-cultural investigation. *Communication Education, 45*, 200-211.
- Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Merkin, R.S. (2006). Power distance and facework strategies. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 35*, 139-160.
- Mottet, T., & Richmond, V. (1998). An inductive analysis of verbal immediacy: Alternative conceptualization of relational verbal approach/avoidance strategies. *Communication Quarterly, 46*, 25-40.
- Mulder, M. (1977). *The daily power game*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Myers, S.A., Zhong, M., & Guan, S. (1998). Instructor immediacy in the Chinese college classroom. *Communication Studies, 49*, 240-254.
- Neuliep, J. W. (1997). A cross-cultural comparison of teacher immediacy in American and Japanese college classrooms. *Communication Research, 24*, 431-451.
- Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Masumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Pan, X., Takai, J., et al. (2001). Face and facework in conflict: A cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Monographs, 68*, 235-258.
- Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Chew-Sanchez, M.I., Harris, R., Wilcox, R., & Stumpf, S. (2003). Face and facework in conflicts with parents and siblings: A cross-cultural comparison of Germans, Japanese, Mexicans, and U.S. Americans. *The Journal of Family Communication, 3*, 67-93.
- O'Keefe, O., & O'Keefe, W.M. (2004). Business behaviors in Brazil and the USA: Understanding the gaps. *International Journal of Social Economics, 31*, 614-622.

- Oyserman, D., Coon, H., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 3-72.
- Porter, R.E., & Samovar, L.A. (1998). Cultural influences on emotional expression: implications for intercultural communication. In P.A. Andersen & L.K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 451-472). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Powell, L., Hamilton, T., Hickson, M., & Stuckey, J. (2001). The relationship of homophily to verbal and nonverbal immediacy in the classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, 18, 217-222.
- Pribyl, C.B., Sakamoto, M., & Keaten, J.A. (2004). The relationship between nonverbal immediacy, student motivation, and perceived cognitive learning among Japanese college students. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 46, 73-85.
- Richardson, R.M., & Smith, S.W. (2007). The influence of high/low-context culture and power distance on choice of communication media: Students' media choice to communicate with professors in Japan and America. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 31, 479-501.
- Richmond, V.P., Gorham, J., & McCroskey, J.C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. *Communication Yearbook*, 10, 574-590.
- Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (2000). The impact of supervisor and subordinate immediacy on relational and organizational outcomes. *Communication Monographs*, 67, 85-95.
- Richmond, V. P., Smith, R. S., Jr., Heisel, A. D., & McCroskey, J. C. (2002). The association of physician communicative style with physician credibility and patient satisfaction. *Communication Research Reports*, 19, 207-215.
- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Johnson, A. D. (2003). Development of the nonverbal immediacy scale (NIS): Measures of self- and other-reported nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, 51, 504-517.
- Roach, D.K., & Byrne, R.P. (2001). A cross-cultural comparison of instructor communication in American and German classrooms. *Communication Education*, 50, 1-14.
- Roach, D.K., Cornett-DeVito, M.M., & DeVito, R. (2005). A cross-cultural comparison of instructor communication in American and French classrooms. *Communication Quarterly*, 53, 87-107.

- Robinson, R.Y., & Richmond, V.P. (1995). Validity of the verbal immediacy scale. *Communication Research Reports*, 12, 80-84.
- Rocca, K.A., & McCroskey, J.C. (1999). The interrelationship of student ratings of instructor's immediacy, verbal aggressiveness, homophily, and interpersonal attraction. *Communication Education*, 48, 308-316.
- Russo, N.F. (1975). Eye contact, interpersonal distance, and the equilibrium theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 497-502.
- Saechou, T. (2005). *Verbal and nonverbal immediacy: sex differences and international teaching assistants*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- Schrodt, P., & Witt, P.L. (2006). Students' attributions of instructor credibility as a function of students' expectations of instructional technology use and nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Education*, 55, 1-20.
- Schrodt, P., Witt, P.L., Turman, P.D., Myers, S.A., Barton, M.H., & Jernberg, K.A. (2009). Instructor credibility as a mediator of instructors' prosocial communication behaviors and students' learning outcomes. *Communication Education*, 58, 350-371.
- Shuter, R. (1976). Proxemics and tactility in Latin America. *Journal of Communication*, 26, 46-52.
- Singelis, T.M., & Brown, W. (1995). Culture, Self, and Collectivist Communication: linking culture to individual behavior. *Human Communication Research*, 21, 354-389.
- Slane, S., & Leak, G. (1978). Effects of self-perceived nonverbal immediacy behaviors on interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Psychology*, 98, 241-248.
- Smythe, M.J., & Hess, J.A. (2005). Are student self-reports a valid method for measuring teacher nonverbal immediacy? *Communication Education*, 54, 170-179.
- Snodgrass, S.E., Hecht, M.A., & Ploutz-Snyder, R. (1998). Interpersonal sensitivity: Expressivity or perceptivity? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 238-249.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (1997). Unequal relationships in high and low power distance societies. A comparative study of tutor-student role relations in Britain and China. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 28, 284-302.

- Sussman, N. M., & Rosenfeld, H.M. (1982). Influence of culture, language, and sex on conversational distance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 66-74.
- Teven, J.J., & Hanson, T.L. (2004). The impact of teacher immediacy and perceived caring on teacher competence and trustworthiness. *Communication Quarterly*, 52, 39-53.
- Teven, J.J. (2007). Effects of supervisor social influence, nonverbal immediacy, and biological sex on subordinates' perceptions of job satisfaction, liking, and supervisor credibility. *Communication Quarterly*, 55, 155-177.
- Teven, J.J., & Winters, J.L. (2007). Pharmaceutical representatives' social influence behaviors and communication orientations: relationships with adaptive selling and sales performance. *Human Communication. A publication of the Pacific and Asian Communication Association*, 10, 465-486.
- Thomas, C.E., Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (1994). The association between immediacy and socio-communicative style. *Communication Research Reports*, 11, 107-115.
- Thweatt, S.T., & McCroskey, J.C. (1998). The impact of teacher immediacy and misbehaviors on teacher credibility. *Communication Education*, 47, 348-358.
- Ting-Toomey, S., & Chung, L. (1996). Cross-cultural interpersonal communication: Theoretical trends and research directions. In W.B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey & T. Nishida (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 3-19). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Triandis, H.C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: John Wiley.
- Triandis, H.C., Bontempo, R., Betancourt, H., Bond, M., Leung, K., Brenes, A., et al. (1986). The measurement of the etic aspects of individualism and collectivism across cultures. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 257-267.
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Turman, P.D. (2008). Coaches' immediacy behaviors as predictors of athletes' perceptions of satisfaction and team cohesion. *Western Journal of Communication*, 72, 162-179.

- van Hemert, D.A., Poortinga, Y.H., & van de Vijver, F.J.R. (2007). Emotion and culture: A meta-analysis. *Cognition and Emotion*, 21, 913-943.
- Wiener, M., & Mehrabian, A. (1968). *Language within language: Immediacy, a channel in verbal communication*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Wilkins, B.M., & Andersen, P.A. (1991). Gender differences and similarities in communication. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 5, 6-35.
- Witt, P., & Wheelless, L.R. (2001). An experimental study of teacher's verbal and nonverbal immediacy and students' affective and cognitive learning. *Communication Education*, 50, 327-342.
- Witt, P.L., Wheelless, L.R., & Allen, M. (2004). A meta-analytical review of the relationship between teacher immediacy and student learning. *Communication Monographs*, 71, 184-207.
- Yum, J.O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communication Monographs*, 55, 374-388.
- Zhang, Q. (2005a). Teacher immediacy and classroom communication apprehension: a cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 34, 50-64.
- Zhang, Q. (2005b). Immediacy, humor, power distance, and classroom communication apprehension in Chinese college classrooms. *Communication Quarterly*, 53, 109-124.
- Zhang, Q. (2006). Teacher immediacy and classroom communication apprehension: A cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 34, 50-64.
- Zhang, Q., & Oetzel, J.G. (2006). Constructing and validating a teacher immediacy scale: A Chinese perspective. *Communication Education*, 55, 218-241.
- Zhang, Q., Oetzel, J.G., Gao, X., Wilcox, R., & Takai, J. (2007). Teacher immediacy scales: testing for validity across cultures. *Communication Education*, 56, 228-248.
- Zimmerman, M.L. (1993). *A comparison of nonverbally communicated immediacy behaviors in medical interviews of Latino and non-Latino white physicians and patients*. Unpublished dissertation. University of San Francisco.